

The CLERGY REVIEW

NEW SERIES.

VOL. XXV, No. 10.

OCTOBER 1945

NEWMAN MEMORIAL NUMBER

WAS NEWMAN BADLY TREATED?

IT has been a rather surprising feature of the earlier celebrations concerning Newman's conversion that Catholic speakers have revived the belief that Newman as a Catholic was always "a square peg in a round hole", and that Catholics distrusted him as being too much an Oxford man. The story of his various abortive attempts to carry out tasks which he undertook at the request of Catholic bishops has been retold with all the appropriate expressions of regret at their lack of understanding or sympathy. And the prevailing impression has been endorsed, rather than corrected, that Newman's life as a Catholic was a long series of frustrations and disappointments because the Catholics of his time were both unable and unwilling to make full use of his genius and of his generous service. It is assumed that Newman's troubles and difficulties were the direct result of his being a convert, and that the Catholic atmosphere and organization prevented him from ever regaining the influence which he had held as an Anglican.

Yet the facts, to anyone who studies the story without preconceived notions, were quite startlingly different. Unquestionably Newman did suffer much from frustration in undertakings which could not have succeeded. But it was not because he was a convert. On the contrary, his promotion to positions of high authority in the Catholic Church within a very short time after he joined it was extremely rapid. There was certainly enough jealousy and suspicion of him among individuals to make him feel unhappy at first; but such private expressions of distrust were more than compensated by the invitations which poured upon him to take a foremost place in the Church's public life in England. Within four years of his conversion he had been appointed by Rome as head of an active religious congregation which included some of the most gifted priests in England. His controversial writings on the "Difficulties of Anglicans" and on "The Position of Catholics in England" were undertaken reluctantly, but with resounding success, at the urgent invitation of bishops. When his addresses in Birmingham led to his prosecution for criminal libel by Father Achilli, he received overwhelming support from Catholics in all the English-speaking countries. He was invited by Archbishop Cullen to found a Catholic University in Dublin, which would never have been contemplated without him as its head. And while he was rector

of the Catholic University Cardinal Wiseman actually informed him that the Pope had agreed to make him a bishop so that he could meet the Irish Hierarchy on level terms. All this was within ten years of his becoming a Catholic, and long before the supreme honour of being made a Cardinal was conferred upon him towards the close of his long life.

To say that his Catholic life was thwarted by lack of encouragement would be untrue. But scarcely less unreasonable is the general belief that he sacrificed a position of great influence and authority in the Church of England. His influence was, in fact, so personal that misconceptions are scarcely surprising. Even Father Dominic Barberi, who had been following the Oxford Movement with intense admiration and sympathy for five years before Newman became his convert, had a very mistaken idea of his position. Father Dominic wrote to his superiors in Rome in 1844 with such a glowing account of his authority that the General, in replying, referred to him as "the head of Oxford University". Father Dominic explained next time that Newman was not "the head of Oxford University" but of "a religious house near Oxford, called Littlemore", though in fact Newman had formally disclaimed any intention of founding a religious community. And when in October 1845 Father Dominic wrote from Belgium to report in detail on the glorious news that a few days earlier he had himself received the submission of Newman and several of his companions at Littlemore, his description was again far out of focus. "Newman," he wrote to his General, "has been up to now what I might term the Pope of the Protestants, the soul of the Puseyite party, which is the most widely diffused in the Church of England and embraces all that is serious and devout in the Protestant Church." But it was really even more fantastic to describe Newman at that time as "the Pope of the Protestants" than it had been to call him the "head of Oxford University". So far as the University was concerned, he had never been more than a fellow of Oriel College, who did not even act as a tutor because the Provost would not allot pupils to him. And in the Church of England he had never occupied any position of authority except as Vicar of St. Mary's in Oxford, and he had resigned from St. Mary's for several years before 1845.

Not only had he resigned his living in 1843, but he had for several years regarded himself as being only in lay communion with the Church to which he still professed allegiance. The *Apologia* shows quite clearly that Newman had lost all sense of security as an Anglican, for at least five years before his conversion. In a letter written in October 1840 he says that "for a year past a feeling has been growing upon me that I ought to give up St. Mary's"—which was his only official position. Early in 1841 his Tract Ninety, which had been intended to assist others to clarify their views, and to share his conviction that the Anglican Articles of Belief could all be interpreted in a Catholic sense, was publicly condemned in the University, and at the request of his bishop Newman agreed at once to discontinue the "Tracts for the Times". At Littlemore, where he had built a

small church to serve the poorest part of his parish, he hoped to forget controversy and devote himself to study. But in October 1841 he was compelled in conscience to make a public protest against the appointment of an Anglican bishop in Jerusalem with jurisdiction over Lutherans and Calvinists. Even at that stage he was writing to his bishop: "It seems as if I were never to write to your Lordship without giving you pain." He had withdrawn entirely from public controversy, giving up all thought of leading others; and even this protest against the appointment of the Bishop of Jerusalem was addressed by him to both the Archbishop of Canterbury and to the Bishop of Oxford, not as part of any public agitation but "by way of relieving my conscience, being a priest of the English Church and Vicar of St. Mary the Virgin's, Oxford".

From the end of 1841, Newman himself asserts in the *Apologia*, "I was on my death bed, as regards my membership with the Anglican Church." Reviewing his position at the time, he explains that already he "expected or intended gradually to fall back into Lay Communion", although he "never contemplated leaving the Church of England". Accordingly he retired to Littlemore, and in influencing such friends as still turned to him for advice he "kept back all persons who were disposed to go to Rome with all my might". He "regarded Littlemore as my Torres Vedras, and thought that some day we might advance again within the Anglican Church, as we had been forced to retire". Plainly there was not much hope left of exercising any official influence within the Church of England. But even at Littlemore he was to be pursued by suspicions and angry criticism which compelled his bishop to demand explanations. In April 1842 the bishop forwarded to Newman, with a genuinely friendly letter, a newspaper cutting which complained that a "so-called Anglo-Catholic Monastery is in process of erection at Littlemore". The bishop explained that he was quite sure that Newman would not "originate any measure of importance without authority from the heads of the Church", but asked for such an explanation of the facts as would "put it in my power to contradict" the accusations. The incident shows how Newman was pursued by hostile influences even before he had sought refuge in complete seclusion; and Newman's reply reveals that he had abandoned all thought of doing more than satisfying his own conscience by prayer. "For many years, at least thirteen," he wrote to the bishop, "I have wished to give myself to a life of greater religious regularity than I have hitherto led; but it is very unpleasant to confess such a wish even to my Bishop, because it seems arrogant, and because it is committing me to a profession which may come to nothing. For what have I done that I am to be called to account by the world for my private actions, in a way in which no one else is called? . . . I feel it very cruel, though the parties in fault do not know what they are doing, that very sacred matters between me and my conscience are made a matter of public talk. . . . I am thinking of myself alone, not aiming at any ecclesiastical or external effects."

Not even in the first years after his conversion, when he was naturally regarded with suspicion as a former opponent who might quite conceivably not continue as a Catholic, was Newman ever persecuted in his private life as he was during his last years as an Anglican. At Littlemore he was continually invaded with that "unmannerly and unfeeling curiosity" which he told the Bishop of Oxford that he desired to escape. Still more, he was prevented from taking any active part in the life of the Church of England. It is illuminating to contrast the poignant letters from Littlemore in which he has to defend himself against encroachment upon his "most sacred and conscientious resolves and acts", and the letters a few years after his conversion when he had returned from Rome to England and was beginning to organize the future work of the Oratorians. Their position was inevitably most delicate. A few years earlier they had been urging those whom they could influence to keep out of the Catholic Church, and now they were coming forward as official Catholic apologists. No matter how discreetly or humbly they now desired to serve, suspicion towards them was unavoidable. But men of their education and experience and apostolic temper could not be expected to lie low for fear of incurring criticism. The chief complaint against them almost from the first was excess of zeal, and Newman's sensitive spirit was very naturally hurt by such discouragement. When Ullathorne told him in an interview that he thought Faber's *Lives of the Saints* would do harm by giving an exaggerated idea of credulity among Catholics, Newman reported the interview to one of his colleagues with some bitterness. "He said we must do something to soothe the 'jealousy' of the clergy. I did not reply—but this strikes me as impertinent—*why* are they jealous? *What* have we done? Since the day we were Catholics they have been bursting with 'jealousy' and we are on every occasion to give way to this indefinite terror." These outbursts against unfair suspicion show Newman's courage, and they enhance one's admiration for him. Bishop Ullathorne unquestionably valued him all the more because he asserted his rights and spoke his mind. The early criticism and suspicion which pained Newman arose from the atmosphere of the time and from the fact that Newman and his friends had so recently been apologists on the other side. It was the older men who never trusted him, but their influence did not last long. "The truth is," he wrote to Frederick Capes at the end of 1848, "these old priests will be satisfied with nothing. They have pursued us with criticism ever since we were Catholics. Why do you keep together? Why don't you go to Rome? Why do you go to Rome? Why do you rush into the Confessional before you are examined in all dogmatics and all morals? Why do you sit idle? What a short noviciate you have had! When did you read morals? None of these questions are fictitious and they are but samples of a hundred. No, we must go our own way; we must look to the Fount of Grace for blessing and for guidance and we must care nothing (and we don't certainly care over much) for the tongues about us."

Even if Newman had been subjected to such mistrust during his whole life as a Catholic, it would have been less crippling and less discouraging than his experience as an Anglican. But although his treatment by the old-fashioned clergy was suspicious at first, the attitude of the Catholic authorities was encouraging to a really surprising degree. When he became a Catholic in 1845, he was living in the Midland District of which old Dr. Walsh was still Vicar Apostolic with Dr. Wiseman as his coadjutor. Wiseman had been the most active influence there for some years, with Dr. Walsh's complete approval. And not only did Wiseman immediately invite Newman and his friends to Oscott to be confirmed there; he offered them, at their first meeting, the entire use of the Old Oscott buildings if they wished to remain together. Newman accepted this offer gratefully and in the following months Wiseman did everything possible to make them feel at home in the Catholic community, arranging visits for them to all the principal religious houses in England, and at the same time making all preparations for their cordial reception in Rome. In later years Newman himself stated in confidence that, whereas he had met with constant courtesy from the Catholic bishops, he had met with little real sympathy. But so far as his own bishops were concerned, both immediately after his conversion and later when Ullathorne became his bishop in Birmingham, he could not have desired more complete and generous confidence than they gave to him. Still less is there reason to complain of the attitude of higher authorities in Rome. One of the first letters which reached him after his conversion was from Cardinal Acton, who at once placed his entire influence at Newman's disposal and welcomed him with a depth of feeling and sympathy which touched Newman greatly. And in Rome, after he and his bosom friend St. John had completed their prescribed course of studies, under conditions which showed how highly they were regarded, they were ordained and then sent back to England to found the Oratory in which the Pope had taken a very close interest. He was forty-seven when he returned to England to undertake his new tasks. His active life as an Anglican had ended when he resigned from St. Mary's five years before, and he had agreed to close down the "Tracts for the Times" two years earlier still.

The restless and crowded activity of the following years, until he was over sixty, shows how eagerly his services were encouraged. The story can surely not be described accurately as a record of failures. The Oratory itself became one of the most important Catholic institutions in England. Much may have been expected of it which it was never intended to perform, just as almost every religious community proved to be a disappointment to Wiseman because they were all prevented by their rules from being free to do whatever he wished most to undertake at any given time. But the Oratory in Birmingham under Newman's leadership soon became a symbolic institution in the life of England, and its very existence radiated an influence which the English Catholics had never had outside the Church for years. In London, Faber's Oratory was more active externally and

more provocative, but it lacked the supreme distinction which Newman's personal prestige commanded in the Midlands. As head of the Oratorians alone, Newman would have performed incomparable service to the Church in England. But inevitably his great reputation, both in preaching and controversy and in ecclesiastical scholarship, created demands upon him for all manner of problems that arose during those years of rapid transition. He wrote his essays on the "Difficulties of Anglicans" most reluctantly but in obedience to invitations from wise advisers; and when the public outcry against the "Papal Aggression" after Wiseman's flamboyant announcement that the hierarchy had been restored, Newman was even urged in some quarters to reply directly to the Prime Minister's attacks. He refused, of course, but in the following year he delivered his famous lectures in Birmingham about Protestant prejudices which resulted in his prosecution for criminal libel by the apostate Father Achilli. In one sense it might be argued that he suffered all the distress and anxieties of that trial because he was a convert. Most of the detailed accusations which he brought against Achilli had already been published by Wiseman himself in a signed article in *The Dublin Review*; and when Newman took legal advice before giving that lecture he was advised that no action for libel need be feared because Achilli had already ignored the more authoritative charges published by Wiseman. In fact Achilli judged that a libel action against Newman would be more likely to succeed because most jurymen would be prejudiced against him as a convert from the Church of England. But it would be absurd to suggest that Newman's troubles over the Achilli trial were one of the disastrous results of his becoming a Catholic. Among Catholics his popularity was increased immeasurably by the trial. A fund was raised to defray his heavy legal expenses, to which Catholics subscribed from all over the world, and the surplus was so large that it enabled Newman to build the new University chapel in Dublin, which remains as his principal memorial there today. It was during the protracted Achilli trial also that Newman was invited to preach (as Manning also was) to the first Synod of the new hierarchy in 1852; and his sermon on that occasion on "The Second Spring" remains one of the noblest examples of his preaching.

When people talk of Newman's "failures" in his undertakings after he became a Catholic, the experiment of the Catholic University in Dublin is immediately quoted as an instance. But was it really a failure, in view of the quite insuperable difficulties of the time? And what reason is there to suggest that its lack of success had any relation to the fact of Newman being a convert? It was the Irish Archbishop Cullen who invited Newman to become rector of the University and the Irish bishops gave the project their official support. It was Newman's personal prestige that made it possible to contemplate so ambitious a venture at all; for the University could not conceivably be a success without the support of English as well as Irish Catholics. That the project should be entrusted to him was the

highest compliment that the Catholic bishops could have paid him. Yet it was impossible that a Catholic University established under the conditions then prevailing could have achieved any lasting success. Newman himself discovered very soon that most of the Irish bishops regarded it as a quixotic plan of Archbishop Cullen's, for they knew that there were not nearly enough young Catholic gentlemen in Ireland whose families could afford to send them as its students. Those who did go to Universities required degrees for professional reasons, and the Catholic University could offer nothing that would be accepted where recognized degrees were needed. Cullen had hoped vaguely to overcome this difficulty by attracting enough students from the English Catholic families to provide a sufficient nucleus. The idea of founding a Catholic University in England had been often considered, and Bishop Baines, with his ambitious programmes, had actually got the Pope's approval for founding a Catholic University at Prior Park in the early thirties. The Pope had even agreed to release Wiseman from the rectorship of the English College in Rome to become its first President, but when Wiseman went to Prior Park to conclude the arrangements, Bishop Baines had resented his sweeping criticisms and his bold assumption of authority, and the project had fallen through. Had it been attempted, Wiseman would most certainly have incurred a failure more complete than was Newman's fortune in Dublin. In any event, Newman not only succeeded in setting up a University College in Dublin which established a high tradition that has since been finely continued under the National University of Ireland. One of the positive and permanent achievements of his experiment was the composition of his "Idea of a University" and of his University Sermons, which together have had a wider and more lasting effect than any of his other writings, more even than the *Apologia pro Vita Sua*. To say that Newman's years in Dublin were wasted would be grotesquely untrue; yet some such impression is very widely held even among Catholics, as part of the general conviction that his energies were always misdirected by stupid and unsympathetic superiors.

That impression is perhaps due in part to Wilfrid Ward's treatment of the disappointing phases of his life. His biography presents a most impressive and intimate picture of Newman's life and character. But the many letters quoted by him which express disappointment or sorrow at being misunderstood convey a suggestion of self pity which is scarcely just to Newman's memory. Abbot Butler, in summing up the leading figures of the story in his *Life of Ullathorne*, protests forcibly against all such insinuations. "It has become the fashion to speak of Newman as hyper-sensitive, a *souffre-douleur*," he writes. "But when count is taken of the persistent campaign carried on against him in England and in Rome by Ward, Talbot, Coffin, Herbert Vaughan, and with Manning's assent; how such charges as unorthodoxy, unsoundness, disloyalty, worldliness, lowness of view, evil influence, Gallicanism, were freely levelled against him during a period

of ten years or more, and further, when it is remembered that he knew quite well all the time all that was being spoken and whispered against him, so that he felt the cloud he was under: when all this is taken into consideration, it will be recognized that to possess his soul in peace and not to mind, he must needs have been not merely uncommonly thick-skinned, but even rhinoceros hidid." But those imputations of unorthodoxy and disloyalty and the rest came at a much later stage; and the conflict which clouded his life when he was in his sixties was not with the Catholics by birth but with the extravagant papalism of the converts, Manning and Ward and Talbot. It was they who caused Newman so much unhappiness and gave him the sense of being prevented from exercising his talents and learning to their full extent. But it was the Catholic laity, headed by the Duke of Norfolk, who resolved that in spite of such persistent criticism from the authorities at Westminster, Newman should receive some decisive recognition of his merits direct from Rome. It was at their request that Leo XIII appointed Newman a Cardinal some thirteen years before he died, even though it meant allowing him the extremely rare privilege of continuing to live in England.

The conflict which did cause him acute distress as a Catholic was the result of a deep personal difference between him and Manning, which assumed a greatly magnified importance when they came into opposition over the decree of Papal Infallibility at the Vatican Council. Newman was not even among those who doubted Papal Infallibility; but he knew that some very sincere Catholics did doubt it, and he felt that a decree which made a dogma of it would cause needless scandal and private distress. Manning regarded that attitude as an encouragement of liberalism and as an act of disloyalty to the Pope when he had lately been outraged by the usurpation of Rome and the Papal States. But within less than ten years the Pope's successor had made Newman a Cardinal, and in his own words when he announced that news to the Oratorians "the cloud was lifted from him for ever". It was the over-zealous converts of his own age in England who had caused that cloud, and it was the Holy See which dispelled it decisively, having given Newman the fullest encouragement from the earliest days of his conversion.

So far as the old Catholics in England and Ireland were concerned, Newman's graver troubles arose, not from lack of confidence in him, but from an unconsidered desire to utilize him in tasks for which he was unsuited or which could not have been brought to success. When all has been said against Archbishop Cullen for his unreasonable treatment of Newman as rector of the Catholic University, the fact remains that he offered that extremely important position to Newman within a few years of his ordination as a Catholic priest. The subsequent difficulties arose from differences of temperament and training and different conceptions of what the University should be and what rights the rector should exercise. They have nothing whatever to say to Newman's being a convert. Scarcely

less than Archbishop Cullen, Cardinal Wiseman involved Newman in much needless distress by sheer excess of confidence in his versatility and by lack of reasonable foresight. One of the most quoted incidents, which figures largely in Wilfrid Ward's biography, was Newman's reluctant acceptance of the editorship of the *Rambler* at Wiseman's urgent request, in order to preserve that Review as an organ of Catholic opinion and scholarship, while restraining the tone of indiscretion and flippancy which had aroused the bishops' resentment. Newman had recently returned from Ireland and had deep sympathy with every attempt to encourage educated opinion among the laity. But he saw the obvious difficulty of controlling Simpson and young Sir John Acton, and he only undertook the editorship in response to many appeals. The position soon became untenable, and at the expressed wish of Bishop Ullathorne, who saw that the *Rambler* needed stern criticism which should not be directed against Newman personally, he resigned. Ward, it seems to the present writer, exaggerates the importance of these contentions between the various short-lived Catholic reviews. They are of great interest as symptoms of political and religious thought among the very narrow circles which were concerned with them, and Newman naturally followed their controversies with close sympathy. But they were so small a factor in the Catholic life of the period that their importance in Newman's life has been exaggerated.

The most serious complaint which can be made against the bishops in the treatment of Newman concerns their invitation to him to prepare a new translation of the Bible after he had resigned from the Catholic University in Dublin in 1857. But here also the trouble had no connexion with his being a convert; it arose simply from Wiseman's impulsive habit of inviting help from those whom he esteemed most highly, without pausing to consider how much he was asking of them or whether it was reasonably possible. In this particular case the result had an unfortunate outcome which made Newman feel that he had been treated with real injustice. It had been decided at the Second Synod of Oscott in 1855 that a new English version of the Scriptures was desirable, but obviously there were very few Catholic scholars in England to whom such an ambitious work could be entrusted. But when Newman returned to England in 1857 and his work in Ireland was plainly at an end, Wiseman quickly offered him the task before he became committed elsewhere. Newman himself was almost as unpractical in material matters as Wiseman, and he regarded the invitation as a direct command from God. In accepting it he wrote to Wiseman that he felt "a greater honour could not possibly have been done me than that which Your Eminence has conferred in selecting me for preparing an annotated English version of the Bible". He accepted it "without hesitation or reluctance . . . because nothing seems left to me but to obey the expression of a wish which comes to me from Your Eminence with the concurrence of a Provincial Council". He at once set to work on forming a group of competent translators, and as Ward observes,

"it is interesting to note that almost without exception those scholars to whom he wrote for advice were the typical hereditary Catholics whom he had come more and more to respect and trust; Manning and Ward, indeed, are the only names of converts in his list". As the plans developed, Newman himself prepared to write "an elaborate introduction—*Prolegomena* was to be its title—to be prefixed to his translation of the Scriptures. This introduction was to be a work of apologetic especially designed to counteract the influence of the agnostic propaganda which was being carried on in the name of modern science".

As a project, it was one of the most attractive and most admirable that Wiseman ever attempted. So many of his bold conceptions had required large sums of money that he could scarcely have hesitated over so desirable an undertaking as this, merely because finance was not immediately available. Unfortunately the project ceased to be Wiseman's immediate responsibility when the other bishops joined in giving it their approval. And as there had never been any suggestion hitherto that Newman's literary work would require subsidizing, none of them troubled themselves about the question of publication, or even of paying the incidental expenses that Newman would have to incur. A whole year passed before Newman heard any further from the bishops, and he was as little disposed as Wiseman himself to allow financial considerations to delay any work which he believed to be timely. Wilfrid Ward's narrative implies that Newman had himself suggested at first that if the copyright were to be his, then he would pay all the contributors and other expenses himself; but that Wiseman considered such an arrangement would not be adequate remuneration. The matter appears to have been left in that state until, after a year of preliminary work, Wiseman forwarded without comment a letter which had reached him from the bishops of the U.S.A. explaining that Archbishop Kendrick of Baltimore was already engaged on a new English version of the Scriptures and had even published part of it. The bishops enclosed the resolutions passed by a recent Synod of Baltimore which desired the English bishops to consider a single version, with Newman and Archbishop Kendrick as joint editors. Obviously the American bishops had gone into the question of publication and had recognized that even with the help of English and Irish sales the expenses would not be covered easily. This consideration seems to have been put before the English bishops at the same time, for they now intimated to Newman that all his expenses incurred in preparing the translation might be met by the copyright being his own property. If Wiseman had troubled to ask any bookseller or publisher at the outset he would have been told that the adoption of a new translation must involve the great expense of scrapping all previous editions and the plates from which they were printed; and that practically every prayer-book in common use would also have to be revised so drastically as to need complete re-setting of the type. Even in our own day, with a vastly greater demand for Catholic publications in all the English-speaking countries, that problem is extremely

formidable; and it is difficult to see how the cheap popular prayer-books, which are issued at very low prices because the cost of setting is spread over a number of years, could all be re-set and re-issued within a short period. But ninety years ago, even a guaranteed combined sale for all English-speaking countries would scarcely have recovered the great expense required for publishing a completely new edition of the Scriptures.

Once the question was raised, Newman saw that his own work might never be published at all, while the bishops were anticipating any future claims for recovery of his expenses paid to the translators by telling him to pay them out of a copyright which might have no value. He awaited more definite instructions from Wiseman or the hierarchy, but received no word except from the Bishop of Charlestown on behalf of the American bishops. To this he replied stating that he would abide entirely by the decision of the English bishops. And as he never wrote or made any formal request for instructions, and Wiseman was both ill and harassed by a crisis in the affairs of Westminster, no further intimation ever reached him. His actual expenses were nearly £100, and he paid these himself, realizing that to continue the work would involve him in "a literary trouble and anxiety which would last my life, and a vast deal of harassing correspondence on money matters, and pecuniary responsibility". He felt sure also that the translation would be so revised by Propaganda and by various committees of revision that it "would be made as great a hash of as the Irish University has been hashed". Wilfrid Ward's comment is bitter but scarcely fair. "Another great plan," he writes, "had been projected and great hopes raised. Another year had been wasted. And yet another time the ecclesiastical rulers, after words of most flattering recognition, had seemed absolutely indifferent to the reality of his work. Newman never resumed the task." Whether fair comment or not, the complaint is certainly misleading. It was not indifference to Newman's work but inability to overcome the inherent difficulties of the time that caused the failure of this particular project. And in retrospect one may well believe that Newman would have realized that a new translation of the Bible made ninety years ago would have been premature, not merely because of the practical difficulty of publishing it.

The real trouble was Wiseman's impulsive temperament and his neglect to foresee the consequences of what he suggested. Wilfrid Ward's complaint that yet "another year had been wasted" implies that the years spent on the Catholic University and other years besides were also wasted. But can that be seriously maintained? Undoubtedly this one year—when Newman was in his later fifties—was wasted through Wiseman's fault. But it was not only converts who suffered in that way from Wiseman's hasty arrangements. Newman in his very long life could afford to waste one year much better than Father Dominic Barberi could afford the precious months that Wiseman lost for him. It was in November 1840 that he first came to England at Wiseman's invitation to assume possession of Aston

Hall as the house for his first English Passionist foundation. He had to go back to Belgium without even seeing Aston Hall, and he returned again in the following summer. But it was not until February 1842, after months of impatient waiting at Oscott, that Wiseman at last enabled him to take possession. Nearly eighteen months of the nine brief years between his first glimpse of England and his sudden death in 1849 had been simply wasted through Wiseman's mismanagement. There must have been times when Newman felt himself in agreement with W. G. Ward's lively description of the Cardinal, in one of his letters concerning the *Rambler*, as "abounding (as I think) in most admirable instincts, but not a reasonable being in any shape". Yet whatever Wiseman's failings, he certainly could never be accused of having failed in giving either sympathy or active encouragement to Newman and his friends, from days long before Newman's conversion in October 1845 until the end of his life after so much illness and private sorrow, in 1865.

DENIS GWYNN.

THE TEACHING OF NEWMAN ON CHURCH AND STATE

I

"IT remains with some remarks of Sir Henry Maine and a few brilliant dicta of F. W. Maitland as perhaps the profoundest discussion of the nature of obedience and of sovereignty to be found in the English language." Such a statement from the pen of Mr. Harold Laski would merit attention at any time, but when given as a judgement on one of the smaller and lesser known works of Cardinal Newman, it may, in the present circumstances, be given more prolonged consideration.

Mr. Laski's words were written in 1916 in a study on "The Political Theory of the Catholic Revival", which was included in his book entitled *Studies in the Problem of Sovereignty*, published in America in 1917. They refer to the *Letter to the Duke of Norfolk*, a pamphlet of just over 130 pages, written by Newman during the autumn of 1874 and published in January 1875. Wilfrid Ward, in the second volume of the *Life*, gives a fairly full account of the circumstances in which the work came to be written, and quotes a letter from Newman to Dean Church which gives a vivid picture of both the anxiety to get the pamphlet finished and the dismay which the old man felt with Gladstone. "I never thought I should be writing against Gladstone! but he is as unfair and untrue, as he is cruel. It is a marvel. I think men like W. G. Ward have in part to answer for it—but he should have had clearer notions of what we hold and what we don't before he sent 100,000 of his pamphlet through the country."

In October 1874 Gladstone, who had resigned after the General Election in the previous February, and was now leader of the Opposition, wrote an article in the *Contemporary Review* entitled "Ritualism and Ritual". In the article he attacked with considerable bitterness the "handful of clergy" in the Church of England who were now engaged, as he saw it, on "an utterly hopeless and visionary effort to Romanize the Church and people of England". To the question whether it was really true that there was such an attempt, he replied:

"At no time since the bloody reign of Mary has such a scheme been possible. But if it had been possible in the seventeenth or eighteenth centuries, it would still have become impossible in the nineteenth: when Rome has substituted for the proud boast of *semper eadem* a policy of violence and change in faith; when she has refurbished and paraded anew every rusty tool she was fondly thought to have disused; when no one can become her convert without renouncing his moral and mental freedom, and placing his civil loyalty and duty at the mercy of another; and when she has equally repudiated modern thought and ancient history."

This passage came in for a good deal of criticism, even from non-Catholics, and Gladstone felt constrained to return to the charge in a small pamphlet of fifty pages entitled *The Vatican Decrees and their Bearing on Civil Allegiance*. Gladstone had been dismayed by the Syllabus of 1864 and the Infallibility Decree of the Vatican Council in 1870, but he probably felt more personal irritation with the Catholic Church because the Irish Bishops had been responsible for the defeat of his Irish University Bill in 1873; and in Catholic circles at the time the publication of his attack on the Church was attributed in great measure to this mood. In the pamphlet he uses as a text the statement made in the *Contemporary Review* which he reduces to four propositions:

- (1) "That Rome has substituted for the proud boast of *semper eadem* a policy of violence and change of faith."
- (2) "That she has refurbished and paraded anew every rusty tool she was thought to have discarded."
- (3) "That Rome requires a convert who now joins her to forfeit his moral and mental freedom, and to place his loyalty and civil duty at the mercy of another."
- (4) "That she has equally repudiated modern thought and ancient history."

Gladstone devoted by far the greater part of his pamphlet to enlarging on, and attempting to prove, the third proposition, which was the only one directly concerned with the civil power and the authority and rights of the Government.

He begins by disclaiming any intention of making a personal attack

on English Catholics, and draws a distinction between the ordinary Catholic and "the great hierarchic Power, and those who have egged it on", who are responsible for "the portentous proceedings which we have witnessed". He recalls the debates which were associated with the Roman Catholic Relief Acts and Catholic Emancipation, and the arguments which were then used to demonstrate that Catholics could be and would be loyal subjects of the State.¹ He quotes in particular the evidence of Bishop Doyle given before a Committee of the House of Lords in 1825.

"The Catholic" declared the Bishop, "professes to obey the Pope in matters which regard his religious faith, and in those matters of ecclesiastical discipline which have already been defined by the competent authorities." And in answer to the question: "Does that justify the objection that is made to Catholics that their allegiance is divided?" he answered: "I do not think it does in any way. We are bound to obey the Pope in those things that I have already mentioned. But our obedience to the law, and the allegiance which we owe the Sovereign, are complete, and full, and perfect, and undivided, inasmuch as they extend to all political, and legal, and civic rights of the King or of his subjects. I think the allegiance due to the King and the allegiance due to the Pope are as distinct and as divided in their nature as any two things can possibly be."

To support this opinion Gladstone adds quotations from the Declaration of the Vicars Apostolic of Great Britain and the Pastoral Address of the Irish Hierarchy published in 1826, and argues that the views expressed in these statements did much to facilitate the passing of the great Act of Catholic relief in 1829.² The teaching could be summarized in the statement that "the allegiance which Catholics hold to be due, and are bound to pay, to their Sovereign, and to the civil authority of the State, is perfect and undivided".

But, went on Gladstone, 1826 and 1829 are a very long way from 1870, and since these declarations there has been a profound change in official Catholic teaching, and the position has been completely reversed. "The Pope's infallibility, when he speaks *ex cathedra* on faith and morals," he writes, "has been declared, with the assent of the Bishops of the Roman Church, to be an article of faith, binding on the conscience of every Christian." This question of infallibility in morals is bad enough. Gladstone makes much of the opinion of Matthew Arnold, that seventy-five per cent of all we do belongs to the department of "conduct". "Conduct and morals, we may suppose," he continues, "are nearly co-extensive. Three-fourths, then, of life are thus handed over. . . . I care not to ask if there be dregs or tatters of human life, such as can escape from the description and boundary of morals." Duty is co-extensive with the action of intelli-

¹ He notes the examples from foreign countries which were collected in the *Report from the Select Committee appointed to Report the Nature and Substance of the Laws and Ordinances existing in Foreign States respecting the Regulation of their Roman Catholic Subjects in Ecclesiastical Matters, and their Intercourse with the See of Rome, or any other Foreign Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction*. Printed for the House of Commons, 1816 and 1817.

gence, "so, then, it is the supreme direction of us in respect to all of Duty which the Pontiff declares to belong to him *sacro approbante concilio*". But he goes further. The Pope's claim to the obedience of his spiritual subjects "has been declared in like manner without any practical limit or reserve; and his supremacy, without any reserve of civil rights, has been similarly affirmed to include every thing which relates to the discipline and government of the Church throughout the world. And these doctrines, we now know on the highest authority, it is necessary for salvation to believe."

In support of this contention he examines in some detail the Dogmatic Constitution *Pastor Aeternus*, the work of the Vatican Council. He pays less attention than might be expected to the famous Fourth Chapter which is concerned with Papal Infallibility, but dwells on the teaching of the Third Chapter, *De Vi et Ratione Primatus Romani Pontificis* to which, he holds, the public mind, fascinated by the doctrine of Infallibility, has done very much less than justice. And he quotes the text, as follows:

"Cujuscunque ritus et dignitatis pastores atque fideles, tam seorsum quam simul omnes, officio hierarchicae subordinationis veraeque obedientiae obstringuntur, non solum in rebus, quae ad fidem et mores, sed etiam in iis, quae ad disciplinam et regimen Ecclesiae per totum orbem diffusae pertinent. . . . Haec est Catholicae veritatis doctrina, a qua deviare, salva fide atque salute nemo potest. . . .

"Docemus etiam et declaramus eum esse judicem supremum fidelium, et in omnibus causis ad examen ecclesiasticum spectantibus ad ipsius posse judicium recurri: Sedis vero Apostolicae, cujus auctoritate major non est, judicium a nemine fore retractandum. Neque cuiquam de ejus licere judicare iudicio."

This, he argues, at least in so far as the civil authorities are concerned, is a more important and far-reaching claim than dogmatic infallibility. "Surely it is allowable," he comments, "to say that this Third Chapter on universal obedience is a formidable rival to the Fourth Chapter on Infallibility. . . . The Third Chapter is the Merovingian Monarch: the Fourth is the Carolingian Mayor of the Palace. . . . Little does it matter to me whether my superior claims infallibility, so long as he is entitled to demand and exact conformity. This, it will be observed, he demands even in cases not covered by his infallibility; cases, therefore, in which he admits it to be possible that he may be wrong, but finds it intolerable to be told so. As he must be obeyed in all his judgements, though not *ex cathedra*, it seems a pity that he could not likewise give the comforting assurance that they are all certain to be right."

What was the purpose of this Third Chapter, asks Gladstone; what did "the astute contrivers of this tangled scheme" have in mind? Not the individual, he answers, who is already held in Papal subjection under the heading of "faith and morals". No, their aim was more ambitious, and their purpose to subdue for ever the defender of public and national

rights, the State. "Too much attention, in my opinion," he wrote, "can not be fastened on this point. It is the very root and kernel of the matter. Individual servitude, however abject, will not satisfy the party now dominant in the Latin Church: the State must also be a slave." For, he argues, if absolute obedience is due to the Pope not only in faith and morals but in all things which concern the discipline and government of the Church (the phrase *ad disciplinam et regimen Ecclesiae* seems almost to have haunted him), then, in practice there is no limit to the Papal claim. "Thus are swept into the Papal net whole multitudes of facts, whole systems of government, prevailing, though in different degrees, in every country of the world." That means, he concludes, that the Pope, with plenary authority, claims from the month of July 1870 from every convert and member of his Church that he shall "place his loyalty and civic duty at the mercy of another": that other being himself. The citizen and the State must both be made slaves.

This cumbersome argument succeeded, in fact, in proving very little. The arguments used to defend the civic loyalty of Catholics during the period when Emancipation was in dispute could be used with equal force against Gladstone's accusations. The theoretical claim of the Papacy—whatever it might be—was not the important issue so far as statesmen or politicians were concerned. What mattered was the possibility of its fulfilment. Mr. Laski, in his study, sees this plainly and sums up the position very fairly. "It was not very serious that Pius IX should make claim to the lordship of the world if he could not make good his pretensions. If Catholics did not obey the Papacy in the sixteenth or in the seventeenth century, when the reality of its power was a far more powerful tradition with men, it was hardly likely that they would bow to it in the nineteenth, when its temporal possessions were gone and it stood as a forlorn ghost of a glory which now adorned a novel and secular power. . . . If, as it seemed, the spiritual demand was justified, and the temporal was unimportant, Mr. Gladstone was fighting a shadow. The sovereignty he feared had no more than a historic interest."¹

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 190. Mr. Laski pertinently recalls the delightful exposure of the weakness of Gladstone's argument, made by Sydney Smith over fifty years earlier. "What is meant by allegiance to the crown," he wrote, "is, I presume, obedience to Acts of Parliament and a resistance to those who are constitutionally proclaimed to be enemies of the country. I have seen and heard of no instance for this century and a half past where the spiritual sovereign had presumed to meddle with the affairs of the temporal sovereign. The Catholics deny him such power by the most solemn oaths that the wit of man can devise. In every war the army and navy are full of Catholic soldiers and sailors; and if their allegiance in temporal matters is unimpeachable and unimpeached, what matter to whom they choose to pay spiritual obedience, and to adopt as their guide in genuflection and psalmody? Suppose these same Catholics are foolish enough to be governed by a set of Chinese moralists in their diet, this would be a third allegiance; and if they were regulated by Brahmins in their dress, this would be a fourth allegiance; and if they received the directions of the Patriarchs of the Greek Church in educating their children, here is another allegiance; and as long as they fought and paid taxes, and kept clear of the Quarter Sessions and Assizes, what matter how many fanciful supremacies and frivolous allegiances they choose to manufacture or accumulate for themselves?"

II

Gladstone's pamphlet provoked a correspondence in *The Times*, in which Acton and Manning both joined, and it was answered by various writers, notably by Mgr. Capel and by Manning himself. But it was Newman's answer which went most fully and deeply into the question.¹ This problem of the relationship of the Church and State had been behind the first stirrings of the Oxford Movement, and Newman had devoted much time and thought to it. "The pamphlet, in a sense," says Laski with some exaggeration, "was the summation of his life's work." For that reason alone it is worth some attention.

The Letter is divided into ten sections, and Newman follows Gladstone through the full length of his argument, making rejoinder step by step. The sections which concern us here are Sections 4 and 5, which Newman entitled respectively "Divided Allegiance" and "Conscience".

The argument of the fourth section is threefold. As a preliminary Newman introduces a scriptural argument *ad hominem*, asking Gladstone on what grounds he condemns Catholics for fulfilling that duty of exact obedience to those in authority which Holy Writ demands. What substitute does Mr. Gladstone offer? Or has he (perish the thought) abandoned the authority of the Scriptures?²

In more serious vein, however, Newman goes on to explain the extent of Papal authority, doing so chiefly by comparison. The argument is an ingenious one, for instead of overloading his pages with theological niceties and distinctions, he is able to drive home the important point that Gladstone is indeed "fighting a shadow". He takes his critic's phrase that the "supreme direction" of Catholics belongs to the Pope, and shows that Gladstone has made a bogey of it. "Supreme" does not mean "Minute", nor is "direction" the same as "management". He draws a parallel from Law—from the law of the land. Law is supreme, it directs conduct, and must be absolutely obeyed. But nobody argues that Law interferes with either comfort or conscience. Yet, following Gladstone's train of reasoning, the free-born Englishman ought to cry out: "Three-fourths of my life

¹ The full title of the pamphlet is *A Letter Addressed to his Grace the Duke of Norfolk on the Occasion of Mr. Gladstone's Recent Expostulation*.

² There is humour and irony in the conclusion of the argument. "Can we be blamed, if, arguing from those texts which say that ecclesiastical authority comes from above, we obey it in that one form in which alone we find it on earth, in that only person who claims it of us, among all the notabilities of this nineteenth century into which we have been born? The Pope has no rival in his claim upon us; nor is it our doing that his claim has been made and allowed for centuries upon centuries, and that it was he who made the Vatican decrees, and not they him. If we give him up, to whom shall we go? Can we dress up any civil functionary in the vestments of divine authority? Can I, for instance, follow the faith, can I put my soul in the hands, of our gracious Sovereign? or of the Archbishop of Canterbury? or of the Bishop of Lincoln, albeit he is not broad and low, but high? Catholics have 'done what they could'—all that any one could: and it should be Mr. Gladstone's business, before telling us that we are slaves, because we obey the Pope, first of all to tear away those texts from the Bible."

are handed over to the Law; I care not to ask if there be dregs or tatters of human life, such as can escape from the description and boundary of Parliamentary tyranny."

As a matter of fact, continues Newman, the personal interference of the Pope in Catholic life is most rare. He notes that in 200 years not more than fifty or sixty propositions in moral theology have come under Papal condemnation, and with quiet humour he quotes to the anti-Papal ex-Premier one or two of these condemned propositions—as, for example: "The ecclesiastic, who on a certain day is hindered from saying Matins and Lauds, is not bound to say, if he can, the remaining hours." There is no attack here, he gently insinuates, on the prerogatives of the State, or civil authority.

He then makes a second comparison of the Papal authority with that of a doctor. "Mr. Gladstone says that the Pope virtually claims to himself the wide domain of conduct, and *therefore* that we are his slaves: let us see if another illustration will not show this to be a *non-sequitur*." The medical adviser exercises a "supreme direction" over his patient, orders this and forbids that. "He certainly does thwart many of our wishes and purposes; in a true sense we are at his mercy: he may interfere any day, suddenly. . . . The same journey, the same press of business, the same indulgence at table, which he passes over one year, he sternly forbids the next. If Mr. Gladstone's argument is good, he has a finger in all the commercial transactions of the great merchant or financier who has chosen him. But surely there is a simple fallacy here."

Newman then considers the phrase in the Vatican decree, *ad disciplinam et regimen Ecclesiae*, which had given such offence to Gladstone. He has no difficulty in showing that the two words "discipline" and "regimen" are technical expressions having an exact canonical meaning, relating uniquely to the internal government of the Church. They are not political instruments, "except as the profession of our faith may accidentally become political". Moreover, he argues, Gladstone should have understood this, and the readers of his pamphlet might also have been able to understand it had not Gladstone omitted a portion of a sentence, "thinking it to be of no account", in his quotation from the Vatican decrees. The missing phrase, Newman points out, makes it clear that the purpose for which discipline and regimen are exercised is the preservation of the unity and the faith of the Church. The passage in the decree is directed, he considers, against Nationalism and is a call to Catholics to recognize that the Church is one all over the world, not only in faith and morals, "but one and the same, bound together by its one regimen and discipline, and by the same regimen and discipline—the same rites, the same sacraments, the same usages, and the same one Pastor". This, he goes on, is not a matter of opinion, but a fundamental, necessary truth. And, turning the point against his Anglican adversary, he notes that it is a position which everybody who is not an Erastian should support.

The third part of the argument in this section is then developed. Again Newman avoids technical discussion and argues by example. He shows that civil and ecclesiastical authority function in different spheres, and that clashes have most usually come because the secular government has refused to recognize the sphere of jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical. There may be cases, he argues, when a Catholic would obey the Pope and not the Law—for instance if an Act of Parliament were passed bidding Catholics to attend Protestant service every week. And cases might arise (though this is hypothetical) in which a Catholic would act with the Civil Power and not with the Pope. He gives two examples: a Member of Parliament or a Privy Councillor, released by the Pope from the obligation of his oath not to acknowledge the right of succession of a Prince of Wales if he became a Catholic; and the case of a Catholic soldier taking part in a war he could not see to be unjust, and ordered by the Pope to stop fighting. "Here again, taking the advice of others as best I could, I should not obey him." But why invent hypothetical cases? Normally a Catholic does not act simply on his own judgement; but in the last resort, in such practical cases as arise, he must follow his own conscience. This leads Newman to the most important section of his letter, the fifth section, entitled "Conscience".

The word "Conscience" can be used in many different ways, and half the trouble in argument comes from lack of definition. Newman rejects what he calls the notion of the philosophers "that conscience is but a twist in primitive and untutored man; that its dictate is an imagination; that the very notion of guiltiness, which that dictate enforces, is simply irrational". He rejects also the popular idea of conscience which does not pretend to go by any moral rule, brooks no interference, recognizes no authority—in fact "the very right and freedom of conscience to dispense with conscience, to ignore a Lawgiver and Judge, to be independent of unseen obligations". This is not a claim to freedom of conscience, but the claim to think, speak, write and act without any consideration of God at all—nothing but the "right to self-will". The true notion of conscience still held by many Protestants as well as by Catholics is that of the law of God apprehended in the minds of individual men. Against conscience thus understood it is never lawful to act. "Conscience is not a long-sighted selfishness," writes Newman in a curiously worded passage, "nor a desire to be consistent with oneself; but a messenger from Him, who, both in nature and in grace, speaks to us behind a veil, and teaches and rules us by His representatives. Conscience is the aboriginal Vicar of Christ, a prophet in its informations, a monarch in its peremptoriness, a priest in its blessings and anathemas, and, even though the eternal priesthood throughout the Church could cease to be, in it the sacerdotal principle would remain and would have sway."

He goes on to argue that the "liberty of conscience" condemned by Pope Gregory XVI in the *Syllabus* is exactly that popular idea of freedom of

conscience which would do without God, and that the Papal condemnation is very far from a criticism of the true rights of conscience. "Did the Pope speak against conscience in the true sense of the word, he would commit a suicidal act. He would be cutting the ground from under his feet. . . . On the law of conscience and its sacredness are founded both his authority in theory and his power in fact. . . . The championship of the Moral Law and of conscience is his *raison d'être*." Finally, in answer to Gladstone's criticism of the "absolute authority" of the Pope, Newman makes four points:

(1) "Conscience" must be understood in its true sense as obedience to the divine voice speaking within us.

(2) Conscience is a practical judgement, and cannot come into collision with the Church's or the Pope's infallibility, "which is engaged only on general propositions, or the condemnation of propositions simply particular".

(3) Conscience can come into collision with Papal authority only when the Pope gives particular orders. "But the Pope is not infallible in his laws, nor in his commands, nor in his acts of state, nor in his administration, nor in his public policy. Let it be observed that the Vatican Council has left him just as it found him here. Mr. Gladstone's language on this point is to me quite unintelligible. Why, instead of using vague terms, does he not point out precisely the very terms by which the Council has made the Pope in his acts infallible?" He shows how Gladstone has come to a false conclusion by wishing to extend infallibility to acts of discipline; and he gives examples—Pope St. Victor, Liberius, Gregory XIII, Paul IV in his conduct towards Elizabeth, Sixtus V when he blessed the Armada. "No Catholic ever pretends that these Popes were infallible in these acts. Since, then, infallibility alone could block the exercise of conscience, and the Pope is not infallible in that subject-matter in which conscience is of supreme authority, no dead-lock, such as is implied in the objection which I am answering, can take place between conscience and the Pope."

(4) In apparent opposition to the order of the Pope, the voice of conscience, sought in prayer, and unselfishly, must be sure. "Unless a man is able to say to himself, as in the presence of God, that he must not, and dare not, act upon the Papal injunction, he is bound to obey it, and would commit a great sin in disobeying it."

To support the argument he has developed Newman quotes a number of prominent theologians, and ends with the striking and well-known passage: "I add one remark. Certainly, if I am obliged to bring religion into after-dinner toasts (which indeed does not seem quite the thing), I shall drink—to the Pope, if you please—still, to Conscience first, and to the Pope afterwards."

Gladstone was unable to answer the letter satisfactorily, and Newman had no need to come back on his arguments. They stand today as they

stood in 1875, a valuable popular exposition of the limits of secular and ecclesiastical authority, and a remarkable argument for the rights of conscience as the proximate rule of conduct. Newman was writing in the days of Pius IX, before the great doctrinal work of Leo XIII had begun. The great Encyclicals *Libertas*, *Sapientiae Christianae*, *Immortale Dei* and *Diuturnum Illud* were still in the future, and it is remarkable to see how much of their teaching was anticipated by the ageing Oratorian writing his defence of the Catholic conscience—the defence indeed of Conscience—against the muddle-headed “Expostulation” of the great champion of Liberalism.

ANDREW BECK, A.A.

NEWMAN'S VERSE

HAZLITT said that the “only specimen of Burke was all he wrote”, and a similar remark might be applied to Newman. Like Burke he has often been charged with inconsistency, but on fuller acquaintance his writings are seen to be a reflection of a steady and singleminded pursuit of the truth. His complex personality (so simple fundamentally in its desire to know the truth and to follow it, and yet so keenly aware of all that could be urged against it) and his hypersensitive conscience, allied with a subtle penetrating mind and an uncanny power over words, make some of his writings extremely difficult to follow—a fact of which he was well aware when he declared that he could never be a popular writer. He was a patristic rather than a scholastic theologian and his boldly original way of presenting his thoughts sometimes startles his readers by its unfamiliarity, so that until his orthodoxy was placed beyond question, it was a comparatively easy task for those who viewed him with suspicion to take passages out of their context and make them appear out of line with Catholic tradition. Actually (as Fr. Joseph Rickaby, S.J.—a noted authority—was fond of saying) if one reads on, the temporary difficulty is, if not quickly, at least eventually cleared up. Moreover in his reissues of works published when he was an Anglican, Newman himself is scrupulously careful to add notes that supply any necessary adjustments which possession of the Faith entailed, or at least to make clear that as a Catholic he would have expressed himself somewhat differently.

When, however, all allowance has been made for the fundamental change wrought by his conversion, there remain many characteristics of Newman that are common to his Anglican and Catholic writings, and it is fascinating to follow the history of his religious opinions, and to note how the Faith softened, mellowed, gave new warmth and joy to ideas and ideals which he had long cherished. This is true of his prose as can be

seen by comparing his Anglican with his Catholic sermons, and it is no less true of his verse; indeed the changed tone is more easily detected in his verse than in his prose because the verse was more spontaneous. This may seem an odd thing to say, because one thinks of Newman primarily as a prose writer, yet he himself assures us that his thoughts flowed much more naturally and quickly into verse than into prose. "If I had my way," he writes to R. H. Hutton, "I should give myself up to versemaking; it is really the only kind of composition which is not a trouble to me, but I have never had time. As to my prose volumes, I have scarcely written any one without an external stimulus; their composition has been to me in point of pain a mental childbearing and I have been accustomed to say to myself: 'In sorrow shalt thou bring forth children'." After expressing surprise at the high terms in which Hutton had spoken of his verses he continues: "I wrote those in the *Lyra* just before the commencement of the Oxford Movement while travelling, and during convalescence after fever and while crossing the Mediterranean homewards. I had never had practice enough to have words and metres at my command. And besides, at the time, I had a theory, one of the extreme theories of the incipient movement, that it was not right *agere poetam* but merely *ecclesiasticum agere*; that the one thing called for was to bring out an idea; that the harsher the better, like weaving sackcloth, if only it would serve as an evidence that I was not making an *ἀγωνισμα*."¹ When there was a suggestion later, in his Catholic days, of publishing a volume entitled "Songs of the Oratory" Newman, in a letter to Faber, repeats the same judgements about the matter and the manner of his verses. Faber had rallied him upon his having time to versify, so Newman retorts that he "makes" his verses while shaving, and continues: "In the *Lyra* my object was *not* poetry but to bring out *ideas*. Thus my harshness, as you justly call it, was part (if *nothing* else) of a theory. I felt it absurd to set up for a poet—so I wrote from Rome (where I was) to Keble, to tell him, we (Froude and I) wished merely to inflict and fix sentiments into men's minds. All mine were written with this view, and I think this only—and I affected a contempt of everything else."² What was true of these poems, and (excluding "Gerontius") they form four-fifths of his total poetic output, is true of all his verse written while he was an Anglican, with very minor exceptions, so it will be best to discuss what these sentiments were that he was so anxious to inflict and fix into men's minds.

The first and most recurring was the reality and permanence of the spiritual world, and conversely the impermanence and insubstantiality of the world about him. This had been a conviction since boyhood (he scribbled verses from the age of nine), when he thought life might be a dream, himself an angel, and all this world a deception, his fellow angels by a playful device concealing themselves from him, deceiving him with the semblance of a material world.³ It is significant that the first poem in

¹ Ward, *Life*, Vol. II, p. 204.

² Cf. Barry, *Life*, p. 13.

³ Ward, *Life*, Vol. I, p. 225.

"Verses on Various Occasions" is called "Solitude" (written at the age of seventeen), and this aloofness from the external world, and preoccupation with the interior life—particularly with his own interior life—has brought upon him from the Abbé Brémond and Alice Meynell a charge of egotism, which is perhaps exaggerated, since he divined, obviously accurately, what was passing in other men's souls by an intense study of his own.

There is a Spirit singing aye in air,
That lifts us high above all mortal care.
No mortal measure swells that mystic sound.
No mortal minstrel breathes such tones around,—
The Angels' hymn—the sovereign harmony
That guides the rolling orbs along the sky,—
And hence perchance the tales of saints who view'd
And heard Angelic choirs in solitude.
By most unheard,—because the earthly din
Of toil or mirth has charms their ears to win.
Alas for man! he knows not of the bliss,
The heaven that brightens such a life as this.

In all these early poems description is reduced to a minimum; his imagination spends itself on the internal reactions of the soul to outward things rather than on the outward things themselves; such description as there is aims at line rather than colour so that they may be likened to Milton's early poems, which love the shadows more than the sun, and he is not unlike Milton in his apparent distrust of the beauties of Nature, which he treats as so many sirens trying to beguile him and lead his heart astray from God. They are all intensely personal, extremely sombre and full of a vague disquiet, the meditations of an over-earnest young man tremulously anxious to serve God faithfully, yet far from happy in his religion. No doubt the air of loneliness and melancholy that broods over the Mediterranean poems was accentuated by Newman's poor state of health and the proximity of wide stretches of ocean. The places he visited called up visions of departed earthly glories and empires laid in the dust, so that his voice seems charged with the grim warnings of Old Testament prophets, surrounded by God's enemies or His lukewarm friends, vehemently exhorting men to repentance before it is too late. His sense of sin is almost physical and fear of God's majesty wrings from him many a passionate plea for mercy.

In stark realism they recall his favourite poet Crabbe with echoes of Bunyan and Cowper in their homely diction, though never sinking to the gaunt hopelessness of Cowper's "Castaway". All these qualities may be discerned in poems such as "The Isles of the Sirens", "Absoluton", "The Haven", "The Course of Truth", "Christmas Without Christ", "Corcyra", and "Humiliation". In "Christmas Without Christ" he strikes an unusually joyless note for so happy a festival:

I hear the tuneful bells around,
 The blessed towers I see;
 A stranger on a foreign ground,
 They peal a fast for me.

O Britons! now so brave and high,
 How will ye weep the day
 When Christ in judgement passes by,
 And calls the Bride away!

Your Christmas then will lose its mirth,
 Your Easter lose its bloom;
 Abroad, a sense of strife and dearth;
 Within, a cheerless home!

In "Corcyra" he deals with a favourite topic, the fleeting nature of earthly splendours, with its chastening moral for mankind. The sonnet form is not often in favour with him.

I sat beneath an olive's branches grey,
 And gazed upon the sight of a lost town,
 By sage and poet raised to long renown;
 Where dwelt a race that on the sea held sway,
 And, restless as its waters, forced a way
 For civil strife a hundred states to drown.
 That multitudinous stream we now note down
 As though one life, in birth and in decay.
 But is their being's history spent and run,
 Whose spirits live in awful singleness,
 Each in its self-form'd sphere of light or gloom?
 Henceforth, while pondering the fierce deeds then done,
 Such reverence on me shall its seal impress
 As though I corpses saw, and walk'd the tomb.

There is no denying the technical skill of this poem or its forceful and macabre beauty, though the phrasing here and there is rather awkward and stilted. In other lyrical forms Newman is more successful and attains an Attic grace and simplicity without sacrificing his main intention of "inflicting and fixing sentiments in men's minds". Many short poems might be cited as evidence of this compact and neat expression, "Desolation", "Zeal and Patience", "Declension", "Sympathy", "Humiliation", "Sensitiveness", "Warnings", "The Age to Come", "Hora Novissima", "The Witness". He illustrates his method in a poem entitled "Flowers without Fruit".

Prune thou thy words, the thoughts control
 That o'er thee swell and throng;
 They will condense within thy soul,
 And change to purpose strong.

But he who lets his feelings run
In soft luxurious flow,
Shrinks when hard service must be done,
And faints at every woe.

Faith's meanest deed more favour bears,
Where hearts and wills are weigh'd,
Than brightest transports, choicest prayers,
Which bloom their hour and fade.

One of his finest lyrics, hammered out with unusual monosyllabic vigour, is called "Reverses". It may be quoted as characteristic of many others in its uncompromising otherworldliness.

When mirth is full and free,
Some sudden gloom shall be;
When haughty power mounts high,
The Watcher's axe is nigh.
All growth has bound; when greatest found,
It hastes to die.

When the rich town, that long
Has lain its huts among,
Upstairs its pageants vast,
And vaunts—it shall not last!
Bright tints that shine, are but a sign
Of summer past.

And when thine eye surveys,
With fond adoring gaze,
And yearning heart, thy friend—
Love to its grave doth tend.
All gifts below, save Truth, but grow
Towards an end.

R. H. Hutton must have been thinking of such poems as this when he declared with a touch of partiality: "For grandeur of outline, purity of taste and radiance of total effect I know hardly any short poems in the language that equal them."¹ It is interesting to compare this with the much cooler estimate of a fastidious modern critic who says they are marked "by force of nature and of troubled feeling more than by quality strictly to be called poetical".² Elton himself, however, makes exceptions for "Lead, Kindly Light" and an earlier lyric, "Death was full urgent with thee, Sister dear", composed on the death of Newman's favourite sister, Mary. A much greater critic, however, than either Hutton or Elton, and a poet of rare lyrical distinction, no less a person than Swinburne, discerned

¹ *Life*, p. 44.

² Oliver Elton, *The English Muse*, p. 364.

"a genuine lyric note" in Newman and praised "the force, the fervour, the terse energy of Cardinal Newman's verse at its best".¹

From our point of view some of the verses written on the Mediterranean voyage have special interest apart from their poetic value, as showing the trend of Newman's thought and his progress under God towards the haven of the Faith. The titles of some of them are significant: "Private Judgement", "Liberalism", "Apostasy", "Progress of Unbelief", "The Priestly Office", "The Married and the Single", "The Separation of Friends"—this last named with its tender concluding lines added after Hurrell Froude's death, so characteristic of Newman's genius for friendship. Others show clearly that in spite of himself (and at this stage he was less drawn to the Church than Froude) he was being inevitably led on towards the Faith. "The Good Samaritan", no less than "The Pillar and the Cloud" (Newman's title for "Lead, Kindly Light"), though written in June 1833, is evidence that he saw the power of the Church to comfort and console the soul of man to a degree not found in his own communion. It is indicative of the painful unrest in which he now found himself and of his longing for intellectual security.

Oh that thy creed were sound!
For thou dost soothe the heart, thou Church of Rome,
By thy unwearied watch and varied round
Of service, in thy Saviour's holy home.
I cannot walk the city's sultry streets,
But the wide porch invites to still retreats,
Where passion's thirst is calm'd, and care's unthankful gloom.

There, on a foreign shore,
The homesick solitary finds a friend:
Thoughts, prison'd long for lack of speech, outpour
Their tears; and doubts in resignation end.
I almost fainted from the long delay
That tangles me within this languid bay,
When comes a foe, my wounds with oil and wine to tend.

In a poem called "Temptation", written in March 1833, we have a touching cry for help, and a timid reference to his life-long devotion to Our Blessed Lady, whose glories he was to preach so incomparably later, when all his Protestant inhibitions had been finally swept away, and he could give full vent to his filial sentiments.

Thou, who didst once Thy life from Mary's breast
Renew from day to day,
Oh, might her smile, severely sweet, but rest
On this frail clay;
Till I am Thine with my whole soul; and fear,
Not feel a secret joy, that Hell is near.

¹ Cf. Ward, *Life*, Vol. II, p. 356.

Compare this with some stanzas from a Catholic song on Our Lady in which Newman himself refutes his own frigid Anglican notions of the Mother of God.

There sat a Lady
all on the ground,
Rays of the morning
circled her round,
Save thee, and hail to thee
Gracious and fair,
In the chill twilight
what wouldst thou there?

Here I sit desolate,
sweetly said she,
Though I'm a queen,
and my name is Marie:
Robbers have rifled
my garden and store,
Foes they have stolen
my heir from my bower.

They said they could keep Him
far better than I,
In a palace all His,
planted deep and raised high.
'Twas a palace of ice,
hard and cold as were they,
And when summer came,
it all melted away.

Next would they barter Him,
Him the supreme,
For the spice of the desert,
and gold of the stream;
And me they bid wander
in weeds and alone,
In this green merry land
which once was my own.

Judging from the selections in "Verses on Various Occasions" Newman wrote comparatively little verse after his conversion, but what he did write is in keeping with what went before, though a less austere note has crept into it. There are several lovely poems on Our Lady, a number on St. Philip, who could always move him to tear-dimmed eloquence, his well-known hymns on the Guardian Angels and the Souls in Purgatory, and two strikingly grave lyrics, reminiscent of earlier days, showing that, although he has acquired a deeper serenity, his fear of the Lord and con-

sciousness of His presence are still characteristic features of his spiritual make up. One is called "The Golden Prison" and the other "The Two Worlds". It is only necessary to quote a few stanzas from the latter to see how consistent in certain respects was Newman's religious outlook through all the changes of his long and storm-tossed life.

Unveil, O Lord, and on us shine
In glory and in grace;
This gaudy world grows pale before
The beauty of Thy face.

Till Thou art seen, it seems to be
A sort of fairy ground,
Where suns unsetting light the sky,
And flowers and fruits abound.

But when Thy keener, purer beam,
Is pour'd upon our sight,
It loses all its power to charm,
And what was day is night.

Here speaks the essential Newman, an older edition of the serious youth who wrote "Solitude", still a lonely pilgrim with eyes only for the end of the quest. That finale is described with supreme spiritual insight by Newman in the longest and best known of his poems—"The Dream of Gerontius". Wedded to Elgar's noble music it is doubly assured of immortality. Despite the piercingly tense opening where Newman so graphically enters into the feelings of a soul on the verge of eternity an air of quietude and loving confidence pervades this majestic and sublime work. When Gerontius marvels that no longer has he any fear at meeting His Judge but looks forward to it "with a serenest joy", his angel guardian replies:

It is because
Then thou didst fear, that now thou dost not fear,
Thou has forestall'd the agony, and so
For thee the bitterness of death is past.

The lyrics have all the clarity and austere beauty of his earlier work, and some of the stanzas of "Praise to the Holiest" that are less familiar to us than those we sing in the hymn chanted by the fifth choir of angelicals are among the best he ever penned. If Newman is less successful in the blank verse, his angel's final salutation has "a grace beyond the reach of art".

Angels, to whom the willing task is given,
Shall tend, and nurse, and lull thee, as thou liest;
And Masses on the earth, and prayers in heaven,
Shall aid thee at the throne of the Most Highest.

Farewell, but not for ever! brother dear,
 Be brave and patient on thy bed of sorrow,
 Swiftly shall pass thy night of trial here,
 And I will come and wake thee on the morrow.

JOSEPH W. DUNNE.

NEWMAN: A MODEL FOR THE LITERARY

"AT Cambridge, whose cloisters have ever been consecrated to poetry and common sense, Newman might have followed quietly in Gray's footsteps and brought into flower those seeds of inspiration which now lie embedded amid the faded devotion of the *Lyra Apostolica*. At Oxford, he was doomed." So surmises Lytton Strachey.¹ Newman at Cambridge might have risen as Tennyson's rival, the Spenser of the Victorian age, the modern poet's poet; his description of a gentleman could have been wafted away in a breeze of verse to the Arcadia of the *Faerie Queene*; *Callista* might have gloried in the full blaze of literary renown; *Loss and Gain* could have headed the long procession of modern psychological novels. Instead of his tremendous Brompton statue, Newman would have won a more modest yet more appreciated bust in the Westminster Poet's Corner. In our literary histories he would have been classed as the last of the Romantics and the first of the Victorians, the link between Walter Scott and Matthew Arnold, perhaps the great model of Yeats and Synge, the first modern introspective, even the nineteenth-century James Joyce.

But Mr. Mullen persuaded Newman's father to forsake the Hounslow road and the boy went to Oxford. Thereupon the critic wails and weeps amid his speculations upon what would have happened had the post-boy rattled along to Cambridge, the alma mater of Tennyson and Macaulay.

Macaulay, despite his inequalities, his philosophical inexactitudes and general historical bias, is rightly claimed as a great literary figure. Why in non-Catholic circles is Newman not granted the same privilege? Why should predominant scholarly preoccupations, certain immaturities in *Lyra Apostolica*, the passing interest of the *Tracts*, the lack of action in *Loss and Gain*, prevent Newman from meriting in the Victorian era the same rank as that held by Wells, Hardy and Shaw in our own? The interest that our contemporary intelligentsia take in thesis-plays and idea-novels is not far away from the nineteenth-century enthusiasm for the tract, review-article and sermon. The literary means of expressing ideas has varied throughout the ages, but if the idea has been uplifting and the medium literary, the personality behind it all deserves every consideration

¹ *Eminent Victorians*. London (1919). P. 15.

from the historian of literature whatever be his views or the fluctuations of his private life.

Even though he did not go to Cambridge, Newman is to be grouped not only with Manning and Wiseman, Pusey and Keble, but with Carlyle, Browning and Arnold as being a master of what Sir Philip Sidney calls the "art of true doctrine . . . of notable stirring of courage . . . of strengthening man's wit". He is one of those who were endeavouring to strike a balance in literature between the Augustan and Romantic outlooks, a vigorous *via media* parting the school of Dryden and Pope from that of Wordsworth and Coleridge, between adherence to classical precedence and untrammelled personal expression. Chesterton labels him as a reactionary to Victorian compromise.¹ True in the religious and moral sense, the cliché would hardly do for the literary historian. Newman is a master of compromise, of Victorian compromise between two literary outlooks directly opposed.

It is in this sense that he is a model for the literary, not so much for his style as for the spirit which inspires it. He is particularly a model for the twentieth-century English priest who has to "get across" age-worn conceptions to a feverish world bubbling over with ideas just as old, but tastefully displayed with myriads of twentieth-century purple patches. He himself wrote:

"When I speak of the formation of a Catholic school of writers, I have respect principally to the matter of what is written, and to composition only so forth as style is necessary to convey and to recommend the matter. I mean a literature which resembles the literature of the day. This is not a day for great writers, but for good writing, and a great deal of it. There never was a time when men wrote so much and so well, and that, without being of any great account themselves. While our literature in this day, especially the periodical, is rich and various, its language is elaborated to a perfection far beyond that of our Classics, by the jealous rivalry, the incessant practice, the mutual influence of many writers. In point of mere style, I suppose, many an article in *The Times* newspaper, or *Edinburgh Review*, is superior to a preface of Dryden's or a *Spectator*, or a pamphlet of Swift's, or one of South's sermons."²

Newman succeeded in writing "the literature of the day". In his chapter of *The Eighteen Seventies* Fr. Martindale has called him a sylph (Manning being the sphynx), an Ariel-like sprite who could introduce harmony in an isle full of noises, strange sounds and sweet airs from a thousand twangling instruments.

He is truly Augustan in his attitude to books. Eighteenth-century writers were imbued with the spirit of Virgil, Dante, Milton and Goethe, constantly contemplating man "against a background vaster than him-

¹ *The Victorian Age in Literature*. London (1914).

² *Idea of a University*.

self".¹ Pope was not a deep philosopher, but possessing the "good sense of the civilized man", he enjoyed meditating upon those simple ideas of Bolingbroke, so much so that he wrote a long Essay upon them. Johnson is not often called a Thomist, but read those pages on the human soul in *Rasselas* and you will find most lucidly expressed age old Scholastic conceptions of soul informing matter. Those coffee-house poets were perhaps nearer Catholicism than the later Romantics (despite the latter's imaginative mediaevalism) since their outlook, to be distinguished from that of the Utilitarian philosophers, was focused upon the common-sense essentials of human life and, what is important to us moderns, their focus point was usually adjusted correctly.

Newman, too, was well read in the classics, not only of Antiquity but of eighteenth-century England. With Chesterton he could boast not of having fashioned a philosophy but of having been fashioned himself by one. He was a traditionalist, a votary of orthodoxy, who allowed his ideas to grow and develop so as to be moulded slowly into shape in the hands of the perennial.

"For myself, when I was fourteen or fifteen, I imitated Addison; when I was seventeen, I wrote in the style of Johnson; about the same time I fell in with the twelfth volume of Gibbon, and my ear rang with the cadence of his sentences, and I dreamed of it for a night or two. Then I began to make an analysis of Thucydides in Gibbon's style. In like manner, most Oxford undergraduates, forty years ago, when they would write poetry, adopted the versification of Pope, Darwin, and the Pleasures of Hope, which had been made popular by Heber and Milman."²

The whole of his self-conscious, self-corrective attitude is there explained: his introspection, his psychological view point, his preoccupation with the fundamental, his finesse, his idealism.

But if the Augustans were interested in objective truth they claimed the right to express it in clear eighteenth-century English, correct no doubt but also alive with verve and personality. Here again we visualize Newman running tirelessly over proofs, reading his prose aloud as he would rehearse a violin solo to catch with his sensitive soul the soft cadence of the silvery sounds.

"Literature implies writing, not speaking. Literature is the permanent record of speech and essentially a personal work. It expresses not objective thought, as it is called, but subjective; not things, but thoughts. Science has to do with things, literature with thoughts; science is universal, literature is personal; science uses words merely as symbols, but literature uses language in its full compass, as including phraseology, idiom, style, composition, rhythm, eloquence, and what-

¹ See C. R. Buxton's recent book, *Prophets of Heaven and Hell*. Camb. Univ. Press.

² *Idea of a University*.

ever other properties are included in it. While the many use language as they find it, the man of genius uses it indeed, but subjects it withal to his own purposes, and moulds it according to his own peculiarities. It is the fire within the author's breast which overflows in the torrent of his burning, irresistible eloquence; it is the poetry of his inner soul, which relieves itself in the Ode or Elegy; and his mental attitude and bearing, the beauty of his moral countenance, the force and keenness of his logic, are imaged in the tenderness, or energy, or richness of his language."

Many have analysed Newman's style. It has been found "concentric", like that of Saint Augustine, rising and falling, gracefully circling, as a vulture would hover round and round before diving down in terrifying swiftness upon its prey. People have noticed the controlled diversity of feeling; "supple yet not invertebrate," says Fr. Martindale: the earnestness in the personal passages of the *Apologia*, the delirium in the description of the Mass in *Loss and Gain*, the restraint in the purely doctrinal works. It is an Augustan style, built on comprehensive and intelligent imitation, the style of the scholar, which does not mean that of the pedant, clearly and gracefully displaying the thoughts of a thinker which are not those of a free-thinker.

In one sense Newman is an Augustan, a man behind his times, but he is also a Romantic and even a poet-prophet. For he belongs to that period strongly influenced by the French Revolution. The Augustans had meditated upon great ideas, but in many cases the plaster had been slapped upon them without there being much chance of it knitting. We hear the cry of Wordsworth against the formalism of Miltonizers, the eclecticism of would-be enlighteners. With the new school of poets rises the Revolutionary call for adventure, the plea for experiment, the attempt to pierce the gloom by tearing down of bookish cobwebs.

Wordsworth's simplicity was different from that of Pope. Both poets possessed a high idea of man; both were interested in men; but between them stepped Jean-Jacques Rousseau with all his theories of naturalism. Newman was a man of learning living in an age of frustration in part provoked by the rise of commercialism. Like Wordsworth, he was disgusted at many things in his own age, but like the Romantics he did not trust a retrogression to the age of Pope. He wanted to go a long way back, to the era before man was segregated from nature by misconducted civilization. "Antiquity is my stronghold," he wrote in the *Apologia*. It is a question not so much of doctrine (Newman is obviously not a pantheist in the Wordsworthian sense) but of attitude. There is about him something of that freshness belonging to ancient Chinese poetry. He is nervous, alive, electric.

That is the secret of his sermons. Curious as it may seem, they have the same qualities as several of the *Lyrical Ballads*: simplicity of thought, direct appeal to the individual, humanity. Sometimes they reveal the

suavity of Herbert, at other times the depth of Donne, never anything of Manning's conventionalism. They are Romantic sermons, full of what Matthew Arnold calls "literary energy", the peculiar energy of Byron and Shelley.

"Such art thou, Holy Mother, in the creed and in the worship of the Church, the defence of many truths, the grace and smiling light of every devotion. In thee, O Mary, is fulfilled, as we can bear it, an original purpose of the Most High. He once had meant to come on earth in heavenly glory, but we sinned; and then He could not safely visit us, except with shrouded radiance and a bedimmed majesty, for He was God. So He came Himself in weakness, not in power; and He sent thee a creature in His stead, with a creature's comeliness and lustre suited to our state. And now thy very face and form, dear Mother, speak to us of the Eternal; not like earthly beauty, dangerous to look upon, but like the morning star, which is thy emblem, bright and musical, breathing purity, telling of heaven, and infusing peace. O harbinger of day! O hope of the pilgrim! lead us still as thou hast led; in the dark night, across the bleak wilderness, guide us on to our Lord Jesus, guide us home."¹

Notice the fearless expression of simple truths, "the grace and smiling light of every devotion"; feel the appeal to human sentiment; allow yourself to be carried away by those crowded metaphors, "the morning star, bright and musical, breathing purity, telling of heaven, and infusing peace"; finally, see the effect of those last words, martial in their directness: "guide us home".

Literary energy has characterized many contemporaries who have written with a strong, vital idea. If we wish to imitate something of Shaw, Wells or Chesterton, we must learn a lesson from Newman who understood the fecundity of an idea and who, despite weakness in many places, was a great Victorian rhetorician even though he did not go to Cambridge.

SEBASTIAN REDMOND, A.A.

THE HOMILIES OF THE ROMAN BREVIARY

XI. A GROUP OF FIVE EASTERN FATHERS

THIS month we are going to devote our attention to the contributions made to the Roman Breviary by St. Irenaeus, St. Athanasius, St. Ephraem and the two Cyrils, of Jerusalem and of Alexandria. By grouping these writers together we do not wish to give the impression that we

¹ "Growth of the Cultus of Mary" in *Discourses to Mixed Congregations*.

underestimate their importance in the history of Catholic Dogma: they were indeed *omnes de stirpe gigantum*. Our only excuse for not considering them at greater length is the fewness of the extracts from their writings which are read at Matins—eight in all. We call these Fathers Eastern, not Greek, because none of them was actually Greek born. St. Irenaeus was a native of Proconsular Asia, St. Ephraem a Syrian, St. Cyril of Jerusalem a Palestinian, St. Athanasius and St. Cyril of Alexandria Egyptians.

1. *St. Irenaeus*.—St. Irenaeus is one of the first patristic links between East and West. There is really only one date in his life which is certain; the rest are all approximate, as follows:

- c. 140—Born in Proconsular Asia.
 - In his boyhood he was a disciple of St. Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna (martyred 156).
 - From Asia he travelled to Rome, where he attended the school of St. Justin the Philosopher (martyred c. 165).
- c. 170—Settled at Lyons in Gaul.
 - Ordained priest by St. Photinus, Bishop of Lyons.
- 177–178—Sent to Rome by the clergy of Lyons and Vienne to discuss the troubles caused by the Montanists.
 - Meanwhile St. Photinus is martyred at Lyons (2 June, 178).
- c. 178—On his return from Rome, Irenaeus is chosen Bishop of Lyons.
- c. 202—He dies at Lyons. St. Jerome and St. Gregory of Tours call him a Martyr.

St. Irenaeus is known to theological students chiefly on account of his famous phrase *Potior principalitas*, by which he describes the exceptional position of "the greatest and the oldest church, the one well known to all men, founded and established at Rome by the two most glorious Apostles Peter and Paul".¹ But the writings of this glorious Martyr and keen controversialist against the heretics of his day deserve wider appreciation and closer study. As befitted his name, Irenaeus, the peaceful, the peace-maker, he spent his whole life in a noble endeavour to settle difficulties between the Eastern and Western Churches, chiefly in connexion with the celebration of Easter. But, though a peace-maker, he can be very firm and very uncompromising when he sets out to expose the elaborate theological vagaries of the Gnostics, the rationalists of his time. He is an outstanding witness to the doctrine of Apostolic Tradition as well as to sundry other points of Catholic Theology.

Fortunately we find in the Breviary a passage from Irenaeus which touches on one of these points, namely, on the place of Our Lady in the redemptive economy of Christ. Irenaeus's teacher, St. Justin, had been the pioneer in the exposition of this doctrine.² Irenaeus develops the doctrine further. His exposition has been incorporated into the Roman Breviary as the Marian Lesson for the Saturdays of March. This is the text:

In sua propria veniente Domino, et sua propria cum bajulante conditione, quae bajulatur ab ipso, et recapitulationem ejus quae in ligno fuit inobe-

When the Lord came unto His own and His own creation bore Him by Whom itself it was borne, His own obedience on the tree made reparation for that dis-

¹ *Adv. Haeres.*, iii, 3, 1–2.

² *Dial. cum Tryph.*, cap. 100.

dientiae, per eam quae in ligno est, obedientiam faciente, et seductione illa soluta, qua seducta est male illa, quae jam viro destinata erat virgo Heva; per veritatem evangelizata est bene ab Angelo jam sub viro Virgo Maria. Quemadmodum enim illa per angelicum sermonem seducta est ut effugeret Deum, praevaticata verbum ejus: ita et haec per evangelicum sermonem evangelizata est ut portaret Deum, obediens ejus verbo. Et sicut illa seducta est ut effugeret Deum; sic haec suasa est obedire Deo, ut virginis Hevae Virgo Maria fieret advocata. Et quemadmodum astricturn est morte genus humanum per virginem aequa lance disposita virginis inobedientia per virginalem obedientiam.

obedience which had been caused by a tree. Eve, a virgin destined for a husband, was drawn by deceit into a snare; but now the snare is broken by another virgin, namely Mary, a virgin also espoused to a husband, she who heard the good tidings of truth, brought unto her by the message of an Angel. Eve indeed was seduced by an angel's word enticing her to flee from God, thus transgressing God's commandment. Mary too was directed by an angel's word to receive God in her womb and thus to obey God's command. Even as the former was enticed to flee from God, so the latter was led to obey God, that the Virgin Mary might plead for the virgin Eve. Thus, by a virgin mankind was bound unto death, and by a Virgin it was set free; for virgin disobedience was weighed in the balance with virgin obedience.

In reading the above one is forcibly reminded of the mediaeval poets who celebrated the Second Eve—*Quod Eva tristis abstulit, Tu reddis almo germine*, and *Funda nos in pace, mutans Evae nomen*. It is interesting to find their thesis already developed in the writings of a Father of the second century.

St. Irenaeus supplies the Homily of his own feast (28 June)—a relatively recent institution. The passage is noteworthy, because in it the Saint refutes the Gnostic theory that Christ had only an apparent body and therefore suffered only in appearance:¹

Hoc autem idem et illis occurrit, qui dicunt eum putative passum. Si enim non vere passus est, nulla gratia ei, cum nulla fuerit passio; et nos cum incipimus vere pati, seducens videbitur, adhortans nos vapulare et alteram praebere maxillam, si ipse illud non prior in veritate passus est: et quemadmodum illos seduxit ut videretur eis hoc quod non erat, et nos seducit, adhortans perferre ea quae ipse non pertulit. Erimus autem et super magistrum, dum patimur et sustinemus, quae neque passus est neque sustinuit magistrus.

This also meets the objection of those who say that Christ only appeared to suffer. For if He did not really suffer, no gratitude is due to Him, since there was no suffering. Moreover, when real suffering begins for us, He would seem to be beguiling us, when exhorting us to receive blows and to turn the other cheek, if He Himself did not first suffer in reality. And as He deceived them so as Himself to appear to them what He was not, so also He misleads us exhorting us to endure things which He Himself did not endure. We shall thus be above our Master, if we suffer and endure things which the Master neither suffered nor endured.

The Saint closes his argument with this sentence:

Igitur qui dicunt eum putative manifestatum, neque in carne natum, neque vere hominem factum, adhuc sub veteri sunt damnatione.

Therefore, those who say that He came only in appearance and not born in the flesh, nor really made man, are still under the old condemnation.

¹ *Adv. Haeres.*, L. III, c. xviii, n. 6.—See P.G., T. 7, col. 936-37.

2. *St. Athanasius*.—On 2 May St. Athanasius's feast is announced to the faithful by a *Laus* which to the present writer has always seemed one of the most inspired, as well as inspiring, of the Roman Martyrology. The whole career of the Saint is aptly summed up in a few sentences of perfect Latin:

Alexandriae natalis sancti Athanasii Episcopi, Confessoris et Ecclesiae Doctoris, sanctitate et doctrina clarissimi: in cuius persecutionem universus fere orbis conjuraverat. Ipse tamen Catholicam fidem, a tempore Constantini usque ad Valentem, adversus Imperatores ac praesides et innumeros Episcopos Arianos strenue propugnavit: a quibus plurimas perpressus insidias profugus toto orbe actus est, nec ullus ei tutus ad latendum supererat locus. Tandem, ad suam Ecclesiam reversus, illic, post multos agones multasque patientiae coronas, quadagesimo sexto sui sacerdotii anno migravit ad Dominum, tempore Valentiniani et Valentis Imperatorum.

At Alexandria, the birthday of St. Athanasius, Bishop of that city, Confessor and Doctor of the Church, most renowned for his holiness and learning whom almost all the world conspired to persecute. Notwithstanding, he zealously fought for the Catholic Faith against emperors, governors and innumerable Arian Bishops, from the time of Constantine until the reign of Valens. Being threatened with many dangers at their hands, he became an exile on the face of the earth, and no place remained safe for him. At length he returned to his own Church, and after many contests and trials to his patience, he passed to the Lord, in the reign of the Emperors Valentinian and Valens, in the forty-sixth year of his priesthood.

Such phrases as *Nec ullus ei tutus ad latendum supererat locus*, and *multi agones multasque patientiae coronas*, are remarkable not only for their literary excellence but also for the aptitude with which they epitomize the Saint's life, as may be more fully appreciated from the following sketch:

- c. 295—Born, probably at Alexandria.
- 312—Ordained Reader.
- 318—Ordained Deacon. Secretary to Bishop St. Alexander. First writings against Arianism.
- 325—Accompanies St. Alexander to the Council of Nicæa.
- 328—7 June. Consecrated Bishop of Alexandria.
- 335–337—*First exile at Trèves.*
- 337–339—At Alexandria. St. Antony the Hermit comes from the desert to pay homage to the Patriarch.
- 339–346—*Second exile in Rome.*
- 346—21 October. Triumphant return of the Saint to his sec. There follows the period of the Saint's greatest activity.
- 356–362—*Third exile among the monks of the Thebaid.* "The invisible Patriarch of Egypt."
- 362—21 February. Back to Alexandria.
- 362—October. *Fourth exile.*
- 363—June. Recalled from exile.
- 365—October. *Fifth exile.* He goes into hiding in his own father's tomb.
- 366—February. Returns to his sec.
- 373—2 May. Death.

The name of St. Athanasius figures four times in the Roman Breviary at the heading of lessons at Matins: (i) In the Second Nocturn of the Sixth Sunday after the Epiphany; (ii) in the Second Nocturn of the Third Sunday of November; (iii) in the Homily for his own feast day, 2 May; and (iv) in the Homily for the feast of St. Cyril of Jerusalem, 18 March. But numbers (iii) and (iv) contain the same passage, and the extract under number (ii)

is taken from the work of an anonymous writer who belongs to the end of the fourth, or to the beginning of the fifth century.¹ Thus there are in reality only two Athanasian passages in the Breviary.

However, each of them represents one of the two aspects of St. Athanasius's life, for which he has become famous. The Lessons for the Sixth Sunday after the Epiphany are derived from the Saint's classic controversial work—the *Orationes Tres (seu Libri Tres) contra Arianos*, written about the year 357, the best work penned by the Saint on this subject. The Homily for St. Athanasius's feast is taken from his *Apologia for his Flight (Apologia de Fuga sua)*, written about 359.

In the former extract St. Athanasius explains the opening verses of the Epistle to the Hebrews, the text of which is read in the First Nocturn of the same Sunday; and, according to his usual custom, the Saint proves from it the divinity of Christ:²

Si personam, rem, tempus apostolici dicti cognoscerent haeretici, nunquam humana in Deitatem transferentes, tam impie et stulte adversus Christum sese habuissent.

If heretics but knew the person, the facts and the time of which the Apostle speaks, they would never behave so wickedly and foolishly against Christ as to attribute human qualities to the Godhead.

The Saint follows up his theme by demonstrating how the *Multifariam multisque modis* refers to Christ alone, superior to the Angels:

Tanto melior Angelis factus: ostendere volens, quanto Filius prae servo excellit, tanto functione officioque servorum, Filii administratione meliorem fuisse.

Being made so much better than the Angels: wishing to show that as the Son was greater than a servant, so the ministry of the Son must have been better than the ministry and office of servants.

The Pauline argument, St. Athanasius concludes, goes to show where Christ differs from the Angels and all other creatures, namely, in His divine nature:

sed ideo meliorem illum dixit, ut discrimen naturae Filii ad res creatas indicaret.

to this end he said that Christ was better, in order to point out the difference between the nature of the Son and that of all created things.

The *Apologia for his Flight* fully answers the purpose for which it was written, namely, to justify his abandonment of his see in the face of persecution. As the proper Gospel of the Mass is taken from chapter x of St. Matthew ("When they persecute you in one city, take refuge in another") the Homily, taken from the Saint's own *Apologia*, is very much *ad rem*. He writes:³

Haec cum scirent sancti, ejusmodi tenuerunt suae conversationis institutum. Quae enim nunc praecepit Dominus, eadem quoque ante suum in carne

Knowing these things, the Saints ordered their own conduct accordingly. For what the Lord now commanded, was the same also as He had spoken

¹ P.G., T. 28, col. 258.

² Sixth Sunday after the Epiphany, Lesson 4.

³ Feast of St. Athanasius, 2 May, Lesson 8.

adventum locutus est in sanctis: et hoc institutum homines ad perfectionem ducit. Nam quod Deus jusserit, id omnino faciendum est. Ideoque et ipsum Verbum propter nos homo factum, non indignum putavit, cum quaereretur, quemadmodum et nos, abscondere se: et cum persecutionem pateretur, fugere et insidias declinare

through His Saints before His coming in the flesh: and this rule leads man to perfection. For what God has commanded is most certainly to be done. And so the Word Himself, made man for us, did not disdain to hide Himself, even as we do, when He was pursued; and when He suffered persecution, to flee and elude those who lay in wait for Him.

3. *St. Ephraem*.—St. Ephraem's countrymen, the Syrians, never tire of finding new titles for their national Doctor. They style him: Pillar of the Church, Doctor of the World, Eloquent Mouth, Prophet of the Syrians, Poet of God, Mary's own Singer, Harp of the Holy Ghost. With the poetic exuberance, characteristic of their literature, they find no praise too extravagant for him. And certainly their praise is well merited. The very fact that he is the only Deacon placed by papal authority among the Doctors of the universal Church suffices to establish St. Ephraem's importance in the history of Dogma. The fastidious St. Jerome wrote of Ephraem:¹ "Ephraem, Deacon of the Church of Edessa, wrote voluminously in Syriac, and achieved such great fame, that his writings are publicly read in some churches after the reading of Holy Writ. I have perused his work on the Holy Ghost translated from the Syriac into Greek; and even in the translation I could detect the acuteness of his profound intellect."

On account of his immense popularity among the Syrians, the life of St. Ephraem has been embellished with all sorts of legendary additions, so that it is now a hopeless task to disentangle history from legend. The following are the most important events of his career:

- c. 306—Born at Nisibis in Mesopotamia of Christian parents. (A later legend says that he was the son of a pagan priest.)
- 325—Said to have accompanied his Bishop, St. James of Nisibis, to the Council of Nicea.
- Ordained Deacon.
- Probably appointed headmaster of the episcopal school of Nisibis.
- 338—
- 346—
- 350—In each of these three years Nisibis was besieged by Sapor I.
- 363—Nisibis was finally surrendered to the Persians, and Ephraem withdrew to Edessa and became a monk there.
- During a period of pestilence, the Saint organized relief work.
- c. 370—Supposed visit of the Saint to St. Basil at Caesarea in Cappadocia.
- 373—Probably 9 June. Death of the Saint.
- 1920—Proclaimed Doctor of the Church by Pope Benedict XV.

St. Ephraem is represented in the Roman Breviary only by one passage, namely that used as the Homily on his feast day, 18 June. Obviously, one passage alone supplies scarcely sufficient material for a study of the characteristics of the Saint's writings, nor can it by itself reveal the reason for

¹ *De Viris Illust.*, cxxv.

their enduring appeal after so many centuries. Nevertheless, this Homily, taken from the Saint's *Sermon on Monastic Life and Practice* (*Sermo de Vita et Exercitatione monastica*) is a good specimen of his colourful, oriental style—full of images and similes: one can truly say of it *Ex ungue leonem*. St. Ephraem is commenting on the Gospel *Vos estis sal terrae*, and writes:¹

Labor afflictionis tuae, dilectissime, tamquam somnus est; porro laboris requies inenarrabilis atque inaeestimabilis. Attende ergo tibi ipsi sollicite, ne utrumque pariter amittas, dum neutrum plene persequeris, praesentem scilicet sempiternamque laetitiam. Stude potius perfectam virtutem consequi, ornatam atque insignitam omnibus quae diligit Deus . . .

Porro virtus ista, unica uniusque speciei dicitur, variarum virtutum in se ipsa habens pulchritudinem. Diadema regium absque pretiosis lapidibus candelibusque margaritis connecti texique non potest: ita et haec unica virtus sine variarum fulgore virtutum constare nequit. Est enim profecto simillima diademati regio. Nam, ut illi, si lapis unus aut margarita defuerit, in regio capite lucere pleniter nequit; ita ut haec unica virtus, nisi caeterarum honore conseritur, perfecta virtus non appellatur. Similis item est pretiosis epulis, exquisitissimis condimentis praeparatis, sed sale carentibus. Sicut enim pretiosi illi cibi sine sale comedi nequeunt ita et ista virtus uniformis, si variarum virtutum gloria et decore decoretur, absit autem Dei proximique dilectio, vilis prorsus atque contemptibilis est.

Thy heavy suffering, dearly beloved, is as a sleep; thy rest from it unspeakable and priceless. Therefore, watch thyself carefully, lest while following after neither wholeheartedly, thou shouldst lose alike the present and the eternal joy. Endeavour rather to attain to the perfect virtue, adorned and stamped by all that God loves . . .

This virtue is called special and singular, having within itself the beauty of divers virtues. We cannot imagine a royal diadem without precious stones and gleaming pearls arranged and fitted together: so likewise this single virtue cannot remain without the splendour of other different virtues. It is, indeed, most like to a royal crown. For as in the latter case, if one stone or one pearl be missing, it cannot shine perfectly upon the royal head: so this special virtue cannot be called a perfect virtue unless it is worthily connected with other virtues. Again, it resembles very rich food, furnished with exquisite seasonings, but lacking salt. For as those rich dishes cannot be eaten without salt, so this simple virtue may be adorned with the glory and honour of different virtues, but if a man lack the love of God and of his neighbour, he is wholly worthless and contemptible.

4. *St. Cyril of Jerusalem.*—The life of St. Cyril of Jerusalem may be described as a kind of abridged edition of that of St. Athanasius. The Roman Martyrology introduces his feast (18 March) as follows:

Hierosolymis sancti Cyrilli Episcopi, Confessoris et Ecclesiae Doctoris qui, ab Arianis multas pro fidei causa perpressus injurias et ex Ecclesia sua saepe depulsus, tandem, sanctitatis gloria clarus, in pace quievit. Ipsi porro interemeratam fidem prima Constantino-politana Synodus oecumenica, sancto Damaso Papae scribens praeclaro testimonio commendavit.

At Jerusalem, the birthday of St. Cyril, Bishop, Confessor and Doctor of the Church, who suffered much at the hands of the Arians for the sake of the faith, and being often driven from his Church, at last rested in peace, crowned with the glory of holiness. The First Œcumenical Council of Constantinople, in a letter to Pope St. Damasus, gives excellent testimony of his fearless faith.

¹ Feast of St. Ephraem, 18 June, Lessons 7 and 8.

The Homily read on the feast day of St. Cyril is indeed the same we have seen above used in the feast of St. Athanasius and written by the great Alexandrian Doctor; for, like St. Athanasius, St. Cyril spent most of his episcopal life in exile as may be seen from the following table of dates:

- c. 315—Born in Palestine, probably at Jerusalem.
—Monk somewhere in Palestine.
- c. 335—Ordained deacon.
- c. 345—Ordained priest.
- c. 347—Lent and Easter Week. Preaches his celebrated Catecheses.
- 348—Bishop of Jerusalem.
- 351—7 May. Apparition of a luminous Cross in the heavens.
- 358—359—*First exile at Tarsus in Cilicia.*
- 359—October. Return to Jerusalem.
- 360—*Second exile.*
- 361—Restored by Julian the Apostate.
- c. 362—Julian attempts to build the Temple, but fails.
- 367—378—*Third exile.*
- 378—Restored to his see by Gratian.
- 381—Assists at the First Council of Constantinople.
- 386—18 March. Dies at Jerusalem.
- 1882—Proclaimed Doctor by Pope Leo XIII.

We are not going to enter here into St. Cyril's alleged, but unproven, "changes of faith in the Holy Trinity". St. Cyril's title to an enduring place in theology is to be found in his twenty-four catecheses, or doctrinal explanations of the Creed and of the Sacraments of Baptism, Confirmation and the Eucharist.

The one passage from St. Cyril used in the Breviary is actually taken from the Saint's catechetical comments on the Eucharist, and when one reads it, one regrets that other passages—say on Baptism for Easter Week or on Confirmation for Whitsuntide—have not been introduced into the Liturgy. The passage in question is read in the Lessons of the Second Nocturn of the Octave Day of Corpus Christi. Nothing clearer or more to the point could be wished for. The Saint begins by quoting St. Paul (I Cor. xvii, sqq.):

Ipsa beati Pauli doctrina abunde sufficere videtur, ut certam vobis de divinis mysteriis fidem faciat, quibus digni redditi, concorporei, ut ita dicam, et consanguinei Christi facti estis.

St. Paul's own teaching seems abundantly to clinch your faith in the divine mysteries; and if you receive them well prepared, you are made, so to speak, one body and one blood with Christ.

The Catechumens are next reminded of the power which Christ showed when changing the water into wine at Cana. The Saint proceeds:

non multo magis sic eum corpus et sanguinem suum fruenda nobis donasse persuasum firmiter habebimus, ut ea cum omni certitudine tanquam corpus ipsius et sanguinem sumamus? Nam in specie panis dat nobis corpus, et in specie vini dat nobis sanguinem: ut cum sumpseris, gustes corpus et sanguinem Christ, factus ejusdem corporis et sanguinis

and should we not be even more firmly convinced, that He has given us His body and His blood, and thus should we not receive them with absolute certainty that they are His very own body and blood? For under the species of bread He gives us His body, and under the species of wine He gives us His blood; and so, when you communicate, you

particeps. Sic enim efficitur Christiferi, hoc est, Christum in corporibus nostris ferentes, cum corpus ejus et sanguinem in membra nostra recipimus: sic secundum beatum Petrum divinae naturae consortes reddimur.

taste of the body and of the blood of Christ, being made partakers of His body and blood. Thus are we made bearers of Christ, we carry Christ in our bodies when we receive His body and blood into our members. In this way, we are made, as St. Peter says, partakers of the divine nature.

St. Cyril's peroration is equally unambiguous. He is instructing the newly baptized how to approach the sacred table, and he stresses again and again the indubitable reality of it all:

Quam ob rem non sic attendas velim tamquam sit nudus et simplex panis, nudum et simplex vinum: corpus enim sunt et sanguis Christi. Nam etiam si sensus illud tibi renuntiat, fides tamen te confirmat. Ne judices rem ex gustu: sed te citra dubitationem fides certum reddat, quod sis dignus factus, qui corporis et sanguinis Christi particeps fieres.

Therefore I ask you not to look upon this bread and wine as mere common bread and mere common wine; for they are the body and the blood of Christ. Even if your senses do not tell you so, let your faith assure you of it. Judge not by the taste, but let faith make you believe without doubting that you are made worthy to become partaker of the body and of the blood of Christ.

When reading the above sentences one wonders whether St. Thomas Aquinas had them in mind when he wrote the familiar lines:

Visus, tactus, gustus in the fallitur,
Sed auditu solo tuto creditur.

Praestet fides supplementum
Sensuum defectui.

Quod non capis, quod non vides,
Animosa firmat fides.

5. *St. Cyril of Alexandria.*—This Father belongs to the declining age of Greek patristic literature. He was one of the last great champions of Christ's Godhead and of Mary's claim to the title of *Theotokos—Deipara*—Mother of God. In his life, however, and in his character Cyril was not as attractive as his valiant predecessor in the Alexandrian see, Athanasius the Great.

The principal events of St. Cyril's life are as follows:

- c. 380—Born at Alexandria. He was the nephew of the domineering Theophilus, Patriarch of Alexandria and bitter opponent of St. John Chrysostom.
- 403—Cyril accompanies his uncle to the Synod of the Oak, at which St. Chrysostom was deposed.
- 412—17 October. Cyril Patriarch of Alexandria.
- 428—Nestorius becomes Patriarch of Constantinople and begins to spread his errors against the Divine Maternity.
- 429—Spring. First reply of St. Cyril.
- Appeal to Rome by both parties.
- 430—Nestorius declared a heretic at Rome.
- Further controversy.

431—Pentecost. Council of Ephesus presided over by St. Cyril in the Pope's name.

—From this time to his death Cyril was untiring in his fight against Nestorianism.

c. 439—Death of Nestorius.

444—28 January. Death of St. Cyril. His feast is kept in the West on 9 February.

1882—St. Cyril declared Doctor of the Church by Pope Leo XIII.

Neither of the two extracts from St. Cyril to be found in the Roman Breviary—Homily on the Octave Day of Corpus Christi and that of the Thursday within the Octave of the Sacred Heart—is taken from St. Cyril's christological writings against Nestorius. Both passages originally formed part of the Saint's commentary on St. John which was written in 428, before the Nestorian troubles.

However, the two Homilies give a fair idea of St. Cyril's style, which, even at its best, has no great charm, particularly in the Latin translation. In the Homily on the Gospel *Judaei quoniam Parasceve erat*, St. Cyril exposes the hypocrisy of the Jews, ever indulging in their customary habit of

stulte et imperite exculcare culicem et camelum deglutire . . . Ecce enim, Christo interfecto, sabbati honorem magni faciunt, et incredibili audacia, violato legis auctore, pietatem erga legem praese ferunt. Magnum autem illius praecipue sabbati diem colere simulant, qui magnae dici Dominum interemerunt.

foolishly and ignorantly straining out a gnat and swallowing a camel . . . For, behold, having put Christ to death, they give honour to the great sabbath day, and, with incredible insolence, they make a show of reverence for that law, whose author they have dishonoured. They feign to pay special honour to that sabbath, having themselves slain the Lord of the Sabbath.

The holy Doctor's Homily for the Octave Day of Corpus Christi is a good specimen of his accuracy when writing on theology. This is how the Saint explains the mystery of Holy Communion:

Qui manducat, inquit, carnem meam et bibit sanguinem meum, in me manet et ego in illo. Sicuti enim si quis liquefactae cerae aliam ceram infuderit, alteram cum altera per totum commisceat necesse est: sic qui carnem et sanguinem Domini recipit, cum ipso ita conjungitur, ut Christus in ipso et ipse in Christo inveniat.

He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood abideth in me and I in him. If into melted wax other wax is poured, the two are certain to get thoroughly mixed one with the other. In the same way, he who receives the body and blood of the Lord, is so united with Him, that he is in Christ and Christ in him.

ROMANUS RIOS, O.S.B.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

ETHICAL ASPECT OF THE ATOMIC BOMB

What is to be said about the morality of using atomic bombs in warfare? (W.)

REPLY

The difference between the atomic bomb and those which preceded it being, it seems, one of degree not of kind, its moral justification must be examined on the same principles which apply to all bombing of towns in modern war.

If it is justifiable, it is on the supposition that the immediate and direct target is of military significance for the success of the war, and that the accompanying destruction of property and people, which may have no military significance at all, must be tolerated for proportionately grave reasons, provided everything possible is done to minimize the evil.

The two Japanese towns had, at least, as much military significance as Berlin or Hamburg, and a general warning of impending destruction appears to have been given to the whole nation. Though we cannot say, with any certainty, that the evil should have been minimized by warning the inhabitants of those two towns more explicitly, the Allies have created an awful precedent by being the first to use this weapon in warfare, and their moral position would have been stronger if it had been found possible to give a previous explicit warning about the nature of this new weapon.

One fairly widespread and obvious criticism is that such appalling slaughter, on so large a scale, even granted that it is the indirect effect of bombing a military target, can never be justified by any military necessity whatever; that modern warfare has, with the discovery of this bomb, reached the stage when no proportionate good can be expected from the use of such weapons; and that, accordingly, modern warfare can never henceforth be justified. Whilst always prepared, of course, to welcome the decision of the Church on a moral issue of this character, it seems that so simple a solution, which condemns all warfare, is not in harmony with Catholic principles. It is, at least, for the exponents of this view to explain what a peaceful country should do, when attacked by an aggressive Power armed with the new weapon.

Another form of criticism is limited to the two occasions on which the atomic bomb was used. It may be thought that the war against Japan would have been brought inevitably to a successful issue without its use, and that, accordingly, there was no moral justification because no military justification on these two occasions. This is a matter for the decision of the military authorities concerned, and, until we are in possession of all the data upon which they acted, it is difficult to form even an approximately correct moral judgement. If the destruction of these two towns had been caused by an enormous air force, using an antiquated type of bomb, no special moral problem could, at this stage, have arisen; and the atomic

bomb has certainly brought the war to a speedy end, thereby saving innumerable lives.

As in every case involving the principle of the double effect, one has to judge whether the evil effect is in proportion, or out of proportion, to the military advantage of destroying a place which, in some sense or other, is to be reckoned a legitimate objective for attack. The difficulty is far greater in this instance than in any other similar problem which has arisen during the war: for the weapon is entirely new and even its inventors seem to have had no very clear idea of the destructive force of the bomb. From accounts received, which must be accepted with caution, it appears that people are still succumbing to the effects of the bomb who, at the time, were hardly injured at all, and for all we know this evil effect may develop and continue indefinitely. If this is so, the judgement must be, we think, that the evil effect is out of all proportion to the military advantage secured, and that accordingly the use of the bomb in warfare is wrong. But a final and certain judgement should be withheld until all the facts are known with certainty.

Faced with the grim prospect of future wars, in which the power of the atomic bomb may be developed, the only remedy lies in a convention amongst all people, banning not only the atomic bomb but all bombing from the air in warfare, exactly as poison gas has been banned. One has, indeed, no guarantee that the convention will be observed, but it should be noted that all the belligerents during the last six years have refrained from using poison gas, moved no doubt by the fear of retaliation; we are entitled to expect that, for the same reason, a convention which banned aerial bombing would likewise be observed; we might even hope that this would eventually lead to banning all warfare in the settlement of international disputes.

For centuries the Catholic Church, whilst not condemning warfare as wrong in itself, has always encouraged conventions amongst Christian people for minimizing the horrors of war, and the influence was more effective when the warring peoples accepted the moral guidance of the Church. Modern conventions, restricting the use of certain weapons, may not always be made on Christian motives and in obedience to the Church, but we may rightly expect them to be effective simply from the desire of all reasonable men to prevent their own complete destruction.

REGISTRATION OF CONDITIONAL BAPTISM

In entering the conditional baptism of a convert in the baptismal register, should one also enter a record of the marriage contracted in heresy? (W.)

REPLY

Canon 470, §1: *Habeat parochus libros paroeciales . . . et omnes hos libros, secundum usum ab Ecclesia probatum vel a proprio Ordinario praescriptum, conscribat ac diligenter asservet.*

§2: *In libro baptizatorum adnotetur quoque si baptizatus . . . matrimonium contraxerit. Cf. also canon 1103.*

The duty of entering the details of a convert's conditional baptism in the baptismal register is quite certain: it is mentioned in the formula given in the Roman Ritual and in the *Ordo Administrandi*, and the clergy are accustomed to observe this rule.

But they are not accustomed, we believe, to add a record of marriage contracted in heresy; the common law contains no express direction to this effect, nor can we discover any local law directing it to be done, though it is open to the local Ordinary, from canon 470, §1, to order this entry to be made. Accordingly, in our opinion, there can be no certain obligation to make this record unless the local Ordinary so directs.

Nevertheless, those who desire to do so may enter the details of a marriage contracted in heresy: the practice is in accordance with canon 470, §2, and secures the purpose of the law, which is to prevent persons from contracting marriage who are not free. For the investigations previous to marriage require a baptismal certificate which, in the case of converts, will be that of their conditional baptism at the time of their reconciliation with the Church. In the case of persons who contract marriage without the presence of a competent priest, canon 1103, §3, requires the witnesses and the parties to secure an entry of the marriage in the appropriate registers. But the law, for obvious reasons, makes no provision for a similar procedure when marriage is contracted validly by non-Catholics. The obligation could only arise, if at all, subsequent to their reconciliation with the Church, and on the occasion of their conditional baptism; but this conditional baptism is not essential to reconciliation, and it is omitted when the validity of the convert's baptism is not in doubt, in which case the question submitted above cannot arise. Therefore, since there is no obligation, in principle, of recording the marriages of heretics reconciled with the Church, there is likewise no obligation to do so when the reconciliation, as is usually the case, is accompanied by conditional baptism.

In the case of two converts from infidelity, who are baptized absolutely, there seems to be, in principle, an obligation of making the entry, since their marriage, though valid, is not a sacrament till baptism is received. But, even in such cases, we believe it is customary to omit from the register the fact of their marriage becoming ratified by baptism. There is clearly a *lacuna* in the common law relating to the record of the marriages of converts, and it is for the Ordinary to make further clarifications, if he so desires, in accordance with canon 470, §1.

INTERRUPTED ORDINATION

What is the correct procedure to be followed if the consecrating Bishop is taken ill at the *Pater Noster* and is unable to complete the rite? (W.)

REPLY

Canon 1007: Quoties ordinatio iteranda sit vel aliquis ritus supplendus, sive absolute sive conditionate, id fieri potest etiam extra tempora ac secreto.

S.R.C., 22 May, 1841, n. 2836: . . . concedimus, ut quae enunciatae Ordinationi desunt vel vitiata fuerint, omnino suppleantur ad tramitem memorati Decreti Sacrae Universalis Inquisitionis (27 May, 1840) quacunque anni die ab Episcopo quovis induto de more, ut in Ordinatione, et Sacrum faciente in suo privato oratorio, adstante enunciato Presbytero sacerdotalibus vestimentis pariter induto; et sic suppleatur tertia manuum impositio: *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*, quin repeti debeant Caeremoniae accidentales, quae antea adhibitae fuerunt. Cf. also in the same sense *S. Off.*, 4 March, 1874, and 9 December, 1897.

Missale Romanum, De Defect., X.3: Si post consecrationem Corporis tantum, ante consecrationem sanguinis, vel utroque consecrato id accidit (i.e. graviter infirmetur), Missa per alium Sacerdotem expleatur ab eo loco ubi ille desiit, et in casu necessitatis etiam per non ieiunum.

A useful study of all the possible defects likely to occur at Ordinations, together with all the directions of the Holy See thereon, may be seen in *Periodica*, 1934, xxiii, p. 73. The principle governing most of these contingencies is that the lack of an *essential* portion requires the whole Ordination to be repeated; if an *integral* portion is omitted this must be supplied as soon as possible; if the part omitted is *accidental* nothing need be done unless some positive law so directs. In meeting the situation described in the above question we must keep quite distinct the rules governing the completion of the Ordination and those relating to the completion of the sacrifice.

(i) S.R.C., n. 2836, explains what is to be done when the consecrating bishop uses a wrong formula in place of the *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*. The direction there given must *a fortiori* be followed when the whole has been omitted.

(ii) The Mass should be completed, in our view, by the senior among the priests ordained at the Mass, since the newly ordained are co-celebrating with the bishop and are fasting. Owing to the importance attached to the formula *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*, it may be thought more correct for some other priest to complete the Mass. But, since there cannot be any doubt that the newly ordained priests possess the power of consecrating the Holy Eucharist before the *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*, it seems to us more in accordance with the rubrics for one of these to complete the sacrifice. "Haec (tertia impositio manuum) tanquam essentialis propugnatur tantum quasi conferat potestatem remittendi peccata, ut sonant verba concomitantia: nam nullum dubium est, quin ordinatus iam potestate consecrandae Eucharistiae instructus sit."¹

E. J. M.

¹ Génicot, *Theol. Moral.*, II, §428.

BOOK REVIEWS

Song out of Sorrow: a Biographical Play on Francis Thompson. By Felix Doherty. Pp. 95. (Bruce Humphries, Boston. \$1.50.)

THE *Sorrow* in the title of this play is for failure, and the *Song* for success. Few young men can have been as unpromising as Francis Thompson. His hoped-for priestly vocation failed to develop at Ushaw, although that college is now so justly proud of him; and Owen's at Manchester, which likewise claims some lustre from his name, could not make him a doctor. Seemingly incapable of doing anything except writing poetry, he almost starved to death; but fortunately for Catholic literature he persisted in his singing until at last he was heard and acclaimed the greatest poet of his day—thanks to the Meynells and to "Flossie".

"Flossie" is quite as important a character in this play as is the poet himself. To this "natural Sister of Charity" we certainly owe in the first place our knowledge and possession of the poet, for she kept him alive when he would otherwise have died from sheer destitution. If the play appears to give equal prominence to a common prostitute and to an uncommon poet, nobody should complain. Francis Thompson's poems will now forever keep alive his own memory, but "Flossie" might have been altogether forgotten had not Mr. Doherty made her his leading lady. She merits remembrance.

Laudatory newspaper notices tell us that this play has been successfully produced in America and Australia, but London is its only proper setting, because only a Londoner can talk and appreciate cockney, of which the play is literally full. Its picture of Francis Thompson is so convincing that we think it will disappoint none of his admirers, and least of all the one who treasures the poet's pipe—still holding the dottle. *Song out of Sorrow* is the work of a true dramatist, every line being full of interest; and there is not one redundant word.

L. T. H.

Hanged for a Tale. By W. R. Titterton. Pp. 20. (Douglas Organ, London. 1s.)

HERE is the story of one of the most markedly English of our martyrs, Blessed James Duckett. A Northerner born, he became a Londoner by adoption, having been apprenticed to a Cheapside Merchant. An unexpected customer called at the shop one day, a man from Westmorland; and it was whilst gossiping with him of happenings in their home country that James was "dared" to examine the credentials of the Catholic Church. For one with so straight a mind, to see the truth was to accept it. The next step was equally clear: he must bring the truth to others who knew it not. This happened about the year 1587.

Henceforth his apostolate was to peddle Catholic books. Such a public occupation could not long remain unnoticed by enemies of the Faith, with the result that this fearless friend of God spent the remainder of his life in and out of prison. Ann, his sweet brave wife, was true from first to last. Time after time she relieved the sufferings of her valiant husband in prison, and nursed him back to new strength at home. Finally she met him on his way to the gallows, to speed him off to the Master whose cause he had served faithfully unto death.

L. T. H.

CORRESPONDENCE

INSTRUCTING THE UNINTERESTED
(THE CLERGY REVIEW, 1945, XXV, p. 431)

"Silva" writes:

As I see it, the primary purpose of the talks is to explain the implications of the promises, so that the non-Catholic may understand exactly what he is asked to sign. If "S" makes this clear, he has a chance of gaining interest; a person, though perhaps "devoid of any curiosity about the Higher Powers", is ordinarily interested in what he is asked to do. The explanation of the promises is an opportunity of putting some Catholic truths before the non-Catholic and of clearing away some false ideas of Catholic belief and practice.

My method (and it has so far, after ten years, kept attention) is:

First Talk: a brief statement of the promises. Then explanation of why Church asks them: we claim that she is the only true Church of God, and that consequently a Catholic would be acting wrongly in putting himself in danger of leaving the Church or of depriving the children of the benefits of membership. A brief review of our line of argument for the claim to be the one true Church. (If I judge this point inopportune, I omit and use the time saved in expanding the points of the second and third talks.)

Second Talk: Duties the Catholic must be free to carry out. Mass: short explanation of sacrifice and its purpose; what we claim the Mass is. Holy Communion: what it is. Confession: not merely telling sins—sorrow; does Confession give priest a hold over the Catholic? Seal of Confession and prohibition of use of sacramental knowledge. Fasting and abstinence. Sick calls.

Third Talk: Freedom to practise the Catholic religion means, besides devotional practices, being free to obey God's law as interpreted by the Catholic Church. Our claim that Church the only authorized interpreter. God's law not out of date, nor the Church's interpretation. Divorce and Birth Control. Training of children: Catholic prayers; Catholic school; Confession, Holy Communion, Mass.

Each talk half an hour; no discussion; plain statement and plain answers to relevant questions.

Messrs. Burns Oates and Washbourne, Ltd., desire us to announce that the Third Edition of *Correct Mass-Serving Made Easy*, by the Rev. H. E. Calnan, D.D., is now ready and that copies, the price of which remains at 6d., may be obtained from any good Catholic Repository.

PERMISSU SUPERIORUM

PRINTED IN ENGLAND BY THE ANCHOR PRESS, LTD., TIPTREE, ESSEX.

the
and
ance
osity
ked
ome
false

n of
God,
tting
f the
the
ne, I
and

lass:
ss is.
row;
ssion
ence.

esides
y the
reter.
e and
hool;

swers

e that
H. E.
ins at